tal appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $12,300,000 for the Department of Defense, civil functions, as follows:

Department of Defense, civil functions; Department of the Army, rivers and harbors and flood control, construction, general: For an additional amount for "Construction, general," $6 million, to remain available until expended.

The budget document for fiscal year 1956 included an item under the heading "Proposed for later transmission," for the initiation of the dredging of the authorized 40-foot channel in the Delaware River between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., contingent upon reaching agreement with local interests on adequate cost sharing in some form.

This project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, and is presently estimated by the Corps of Engineers to cost $95,100,000. The amount of $6 million is necessary to initiate dredging and rock removal in the section of the channel between Pennypacker Creek, Pa., and Delanco, N. J., and to initiate action toward replacement of the Delair Bridge.

Substantial benefits are derived by individual users of our waterways. The demand of many sections of the country for water-resources projects, involving large sums of money, focuses attention on the need for developing suitable arrangements to enable the beneficiaries to meet their fair share of the cost and to ease the burden on the general taxpayers of the Nation which results whenever an inordinate financial burden involved in such projects is imposed on the Federal Government. These arrangements should be consistent with an equitable general policy for sharing the cost of essential water-resources projects. We have been faced with the problem of developing a method which would be equitable with respect to the Delaware River project and yet would not discriminate against this project in relation to other water-resources projects. However, considerable time and effort will be required to develop a consistent overall policy and to work out arrangements for its application to individual projects.

Under the circumstances, and since no satisfactory proposal for bringing about an equitable sharing of the cost of the Delaware as a separate project has been found, it would seem fair not to further delay initiation of this project. We have in mind the importance of the Delaware River channel, not only to the continued economic development of the area but also to the Nation as a whole. Furthermore, local interests in the Delaware port area have made substantial investments in related harbor and terminal facilities to which an improved waterway is essential.

Initiation of work on the Delaware River does not change the basic objective of developing a satisfactory means for obtaining local contributions toward the cost of water development projects in line with the partnership policy of this administration, which would apply to the Delaware as well as other projects.

Federal contributions to partnership projects For payment of contributions by the United States for flood storage in the Markham Ferry project, as authorized by the act of July 6, 1954 (68 Stat. 450), $6,300,000, to remain available until expended.

The 1956 budget message states that provision will be made for cooperation in authorized partnership projects such as the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma. This project, under the terms of the authorization contained in Public Law 476, approved July 6, 1954, will be constructed for hydroelectric power production and flood control in accordance with the terms of the Federal Power Act, by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma. The project will involve a total cost of about $25 million, of which not to exceed $6,500,000 is authorized to be contributed by the United States for flood-control storage in the reservoir. This authorized Federal payment will be reduced by an amount for certain lands to be conveyed to the Grand River Dam Authority by the United States, presently estimated at $200,000.

On June 22, 1955, the Federal Power Commission issued a license to the Grand River Dam Authority to construct the Markham Ferry project (FPC Project No. 2183). The full amount of $6,300,000 is required to be appropriated at this time in order to enable the Authority to sell revenue bonds to finance its part of the cost of construction. The appropriated funds will be administered by the Chief of Engineers, and transferred periodically to the Authority in amounts commensurate with the construction work completed by the Authority.

In view of the above considerations, I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriations be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $12,300,000 for the Department of Defense—Civil Functions.

The details of these proposed appropriations, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for their submission at this time are set further in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the Hammond irrigation project in New Mexico.

The Hammond project is a part of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Hammond project would be $3,800 an acre.

The project would produce agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, beans, dairy products, and wool.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose throne is truth, frail creatures of dust serving out our brief day on the world's vast stage, we would set our little lives in the midst of Thine eternity and feel about us Thy greatness and Thy peace. Like flowers in June gardens uplifted to the sun, like still waters that mirror the eternal stars, so we would lift our yearning souls to Thee, our light and our life, our help and our hope.

We pray that the institutions of justice, of united endeavor, and mutual understanding, which are being set up in these anxious yet hopeful days, may be used as the instruments of Thy providence in bringing to fulfillment at last the prophet's dream: "Violence shall no more be heard in Thy land, wasting nor destruction within Thy borders." Give us hope which rises above frustration, patience which will bear the strain of waiting, good will which cannot be discouraged even by duplicity, and forgiveness for those who repent as we ourselves ask to be forgiven: In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 21, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 21, 1955, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 89. An act for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers;

S. 654. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; and

S. 1419. An act to lower the age requirements with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 194)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the

National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems submitted to me through its Chairman, covering its operations from July 1 to December 31, 1954, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 22, 1955.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor;

S. 36. An act for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez;

S. 244. An act for the relief of Anna C. Giese;

S. 633. An act for the relief of certain alien sheepherders;

S. 758. An act for the relief of Marion S. Quirk; and

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2755. An act for the relief of Benjamin Johnson;

H. R. 2783. An act for the relief of Andrew Wing-Huen Tsang;

H. R. 2944. An act for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball;

H. R. 2947. An act for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Dorothy Claire Maurice;

H. R. 3507. An act for the relief of Luise Pempfer (now Mrs. William L. Adams);

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulou;

H. R. 3625. An act for the relief of George Vourderis;

H. R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ilse Werner;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nika Kirihara;

H. R. 3630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza;

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufield;

H. R. 3871. An act for the relief of Orville Ennis;

H. R. 4284. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mariannina Monaco;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Christa Harkrader;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 4663. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Duncan McQuagge;

H. R. 5021. An act for the relief of Harriet L. Barchet;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson; and

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PURTELL was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon in the office of the Secretary of the Senate during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches made in connection therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION WITH REPUBLIC OF HAITI—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive H, 84th Congress, 1st session, a treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Haiti, together with a protocol and an exchange of notes relating thereto, signed on March 3, 1955, and the notes on April 11 and 25, 1955, at Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaty, that the treaty, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the message from the President be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Haiti, together with a protocol and an exchange of notes relating thereto. The treaty and the protocol were signed on March 3, 1955, and the notes on April 11 and 25, 1955, at Port-au-Prince.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 22, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol, signed at Port-au-Prince on March 3, 1955. 3. Exchange of notes, signed at Port-au-Prince on April 11 and 25, 1955, with translation of French language note.)

PROTOCOL SUPPLEMENTING CONVENTION WITH THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS RELATING TO CERTAIN TAXES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive I, 84th Congress, 1st session, the protocol, signed on June 15, 1955, supplementing the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes for the purpose of facilitating extension to the Netherlands Antilles.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the protocol, that the protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the message from the President be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit the protocol, signed on June 15, 1955, supplementing the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes for the purpose of facilitating extension to the Netherlands Antilles.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

The protocol has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 22, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Protocol supplementing the income-tax convention with the Netherlands.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Leslie F. Augsbach and Frank

A. Bialas, to be postmasters at Spring Lake, Mich., and Wilmore, Pa., respectively, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTER NOMINATION ADVERSELY REPORTED

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Merlin A. Hymel to be postmaster at Edgard, La.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over. I have not had an opportunity to confer with the minority leader about it. I expect to bring the nomination before the Senate at an early date, but I ask that it go over at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will go over.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to say, and I call this to the attention of the distinguished minority leader, that it is hoped the District of Columbia appropriation bill will be reported today. It is also the hope of the majority leader that we may have early consideration of that bill, always realizing that the Senate will not proceed until the hearings and the reports are available. In the event there is no great controversy involved, and the minority leader agrees with me about the procedure, I hope the District of Columbia appropriation bill can be called up and considered by unanimous consent, if the hearings and the report are available, and if it seems unlikely that any great controversy will develop.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is now in order.

INVITATION OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA FOR MEMBERS OF THE SENATE TO ATTEND FOURTH OF JULY CELEBRATION AT INDEPENDENCE HALL—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, by appropriate resolution, the city of Philadelphia is inviting all Members of the Senate to attend a Fourth of July celebration in Independence Hall.

I may state to the Senate that the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], formerly Vice President of the United States, will be the orator on that occasion.

I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter to the Vice President from James H. J. Tate, president of the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., transmitting a resolution adopted by the city council, inviting the Members of the Senate to attend Philadelphia's observance of Independence Day on Monday, July 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY COUNCIL,
Philadelphia, June 21, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am enclosing herewith a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Philadelphia, inviting the Members of the United States Senate to attend Philadelphia's observance of Independence Day on Monday morning, July 4, 1955, which is to be held at Independence Hall in Independence Square, the birthplace of our Nation's liberty.

This is an annual observance and a cordial invitation is extended to you and the Members of the Senate who may be in the East at that time.

With all good wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. J. TATE,
President, City Council.

Resolution requesting the Members of the Congress of the United States to participate in the observance of Independence Day at Independence Square in Philadelphia

Whereas the most inspirational holiday celebrated by the peoples of the United States is Independence Day each year; and

Whereas the most hallowed spot in the United States relating to that day is in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., where the Liberty Bell has its resting place; and

Whereas it is the purpose of the city of Philadelphia to make the observance of this holiday at Independence Square each year the most significant celebration in the United States of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will officially dedicate the Mall, adjacent to Independence Hall; and

Whereas this day offers a splendid opportunity for Members of the United States Congress to visit the shrine dedicated to the true significance of liberty, freedom, and equality: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That Members of the United States Congress are hereby respectfully requested to accept the invitation of the city of Philadelphia to participate in the observance on Monday morning, July 4, 1955, and on each Independence Day observance thereafter, from Independence Square, in the city of Philadelphia.

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the Congress of the United States.

CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the original resolution passed by the city council on the 9th day of June 1955.

JAMES H. J. TATE,
President of City Council.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE ARTS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Music Council, of New York, N. Y., relating to the encouragement of the arts.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED BY THE NATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING OF MAY 25, 1955

Whereas the President of the United States, as well as many of the outstanding Members of both Houses of Congress of the United States, have evinced their interest in encouraging the arts; and

Whereas music is a form of communication which knows no international barriers of language; and

Whereas the National Music Council is desirous of expressing its appreciation to those selected officials who have shown a high regard for the encouragement of the arts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Music Council, on behalf of some 800,000 American citizens who compose the member organizations of the council hereby expresses to the President of the United States and to Messrs. GORDON ALLOTT, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, FRANK A. BARRETT, GEORGE H. BENDER, WALLACE F. BENNETT, ALAN BIBLE, JOHN W. BRICKER, HARRY FLOOD BYRD, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, WALTER F. GEORGE, THEODORE F. GREEN, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, ESTES KEFAUVER, HARLEY M. KILGORE, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, WILLIAM LANGER, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, WAYNE MORSE, JAMES E. MURRAY, MATTHEW M. NEELY, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, FREDERICK G. PAYNE, CHARLES E. POTTER, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, STROM THURMOND, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, JOHN A. BLATNIK, EMANUEL CELLER, CHARLES R. HOWELL, CARROLL D. KEARNS, JOHN L. MCMILLAN, LEE METCALF, GEORGE P. MILLER, JAMES H. MORRISON, GEORGE M. RHODES, JOHN F. SHELLEY, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, and ROY W. WIER, its appreciation of the steps taken by these elected representatives of our people to set a pattern for democratic encouragement of the arts and the cultural aspects of our civilization, of which music forms so great a part.

REQUEST FOR RESIGNATION OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Klamath Basin District Council No. 6, International Woodworkers of America, CIO, requesting the President of the United States to require the resignation of the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON RESIGNATION OF DOUGLAS MCKAY, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, used to sell Chevrolets to the State of Oregon while governor; and

Whereas President Eisenhower's Cabinet already has one representative of General Motors, Charles E. "Bird Dog" Wilson, on it; and

Whereas Secretary McKay seeks to either close down, or sell out to private monopoly, the Alaska Railroad in spite of its profitable operating record; and

Whereas Secretary McKay has, by his own appointment, become the errand boy for the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation which masquerades as a locally owned concern and has sought to give away the finest multiple-purpose dam site in North America—Hells Canyon on the Snake River—to this private utility; and

Whereas Secretary McKay has clearly demonstrated by his past and present record that he is not interested in the welfare of the people, but is interested, at the expense of the citizenry, in the welfare of friends in the utility and transportation field and is thus an official to whom the people can no longer look for the protection of their natural resource heritage: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Klamath Basin District Council No. 6, International Woodworkers of America, CIO, petition the President of the United States to require Secretary McKay's resignation forthwith so as to prevent any further looting of the public domain; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator WAYNE L. MORSE with the request that it be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Adopted by Klamath Basin District Council No. 6 convention in session May 14 and 15, 1955.

TIM SULLIVAN,
President, K. B. D. C. No. 6.
H. E. GEIGER,
Secretary-Treasurer, K. B. D. C. No. 6.

USE OF WORD "EMPLOYABILITY" IN VETERANS' REGULATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Craig Mount Post, No. 4273, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Union, Oreg., relating to the elimination of the word "employability" from Veterans' Regulations KA1, part 3, of Public Laws 28, 149, and 698, 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the requirement of the word "employability" and the interpretations thereunder of Veterans Regulations KA1, part 3, of Public Laws 28, 149, and 698, 83d Congress, has caused and will cause great hardship and unreasonable denial of pensions to veterans; and

Whereas said interpretations relating to the employability have not been realistic and will cause the denial of pensions to veterans who should in all interest of social justice be entitled thereto: It is hereby

Resolved by Craig Mount Post, No. 4273, VFW, and we do request, That our national officers and State officers institute appropriate action to eliminate the requirement of the word "employability" from the above-stated regulation and that legislation be introduced at the next session of the Congress of the United States of America to effect such purpose.

JERRY WRIGHT,
Commander.
CLARENCE W. DODDS,
Chaplain.
VIRGIL SUDBROCK,
Adjutant.

COMMENCEMENT AND COMPLETION OF JOHN DAY PROJECT, OREGON—LETTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the City Council of West Linn, Oreg., signed by Andy Harila, city recorder, favoring the early commencement and completion of the John Day project, Oregon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST LINN, OREG., *June 16, 1955.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The West Linn City Council at its regular June meeting discussed the problem of a predicted power shortage in the Pacific Northwest and especially in the Willamette Valley area by the year 1960 unless immediate action is taken to start more hydroelectric development.

Recognizing the importance of electric power as a factor in the economy of the area in general and our city in particular, we urgently request that you use your influence toward the early commencement and completion of the John Day project either through Government financing or the proposed partnership plan.

Yours very truly,
CITY OF WEST LINN,
ANDY HARILA, *City Recorder.*

HELLS CANYON DAM—LETTER, PETITION, AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the International Association of Machinists, Bremerton, Wash.; a petition signed by Henry Pence, and sundry other citizens of the State of Ohio; a resolution adopted by Fort Rock Grange, No. 758, of Fort Rock, Oreg.; a resolution adopted by the Missouri State Council of Carpenters, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; a resolution adopted by the New Mexico State Council of Carpenters, Hobbs, N. Mex.; a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 610, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Port Arthur, Tex.; and a resolution adopted by the Oregon State Grange, all favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1333, authorizing the construction of a high dam in Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the letter, petition, and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Bremerton, Wash., June 5, 1955.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the recent meeting of Nipsic Lodge, No. 282, International Association of Machinists, I was instructed to write you on behalf of our local to thank you for your support of Senate bill 1333, which authorizes the construction of the high dam at Hells Canyon.

The machinists have given wholehearted support both financially and morally to the Hells Canyon Association and we sincerely appreciate your efforts in this cause.

Sincerely yours,
NIPSIC LODGE, NO. 282, I. A. OF M.,
A. A. JUSTIN,
Recording Secretary.

PETITION

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, believing that construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon will assure maximum comprehensive multipurpose development of the Middle Snake, and will contribute materially to the economic growth of the region and the national economy and security, do respectfully petition that Senate bill 1333, authorizing a Federal multiple-purpose high dam at Hells Canyon, be passed by the Congress.

HELLS CANYON DAM VERSUS THREE LOW-HEAD DAMS

In order to acquaint our Congressmen of the stand of our grange regarding a high dam or three low-head dams on the Snake River in the Hells Canyon area, we, the Fort Rock Grange, No. 758, located at Fort Rock, propose the following resolution:

"Whereas the three proposed low-head dams are to be located in the area which would be the reservoir site of the Hells Canyon Dam, as located by the Army engineers and the Federal irrigation group; and

"Whereas the sites for the three low-head dams are requested by private utility companies; and

"Whereas the granting of these sites to the private companies would shut off construction of Hells Canyon dam without bargaining with the private companies for return of the sites; and

"Whereas the low-head dams make no provision for flood control, while Hells Canyon Dam would provide an exceptionally large reservoir in an ideal primitive area for water storage; and

"Whereas the low-head dams require water rights to assure sufficient river flow for maximum development of power, while Hells Canyon Dam would store great quantities of surplus water during the spring runoff, thus holding it from flooding the lower area and also providing power development even during the long dry periods, not only at the dam site, but to river flow dams below, only becoming a low-head dam when the stored water is used down to the river flow; and

"Whereas the low-head dams are of no value for wildlife, scenic, or recreational uses, while Hells Canyon Dam would provide all these benefits: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this grange stands definitely for the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam and opposed to giving away the three sites in the Snake River which would obstruct the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam; and be it further

"Resolved, That we want the Hells Canyon Dam constructed and owned by the Fed-

eral Government, provided however, that in power development, the Federal Government share with the States concerned with such costs and benefits as may be for the best interests of the people of those States and of the Nation, and provided further that the Federal Government enter into such contracts with private companies, including cooperative companies, for the development, distribution, and sale of electric power as will be to the advantage and for the benefit of the whole population; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Congressmen and to our State secretary of the grange."

JESS MILES,
Master.
HELEN PARKS,
Secretary.

LAKE COUNTY, OREG.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MISSOURI STATE COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS, UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA

Whereas there is now a bill in the Senate of the United States for consideration, known as Senate bill 1333, introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and 22 other Senators, including Senator SYMINGTON and Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, for the purpose of constructing a federally financed high dam in Hells Canyon; and

Whereas similarly constructed dams, such as Grand Coulee, Bonneville, etc., have resulted in the greatest good for a greater number of people, and have improved the Nation's resources; and

Whereas the construction of a multipurpose high dam as set forth in Senate bill 1333 would preserve and protect the full potential value of the site for navigation, recreation, irrigation, and flood control: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Missouri State Council of Carpenters, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, at their 17th annual convention, go on record as recommending the support of Senate bill 1333.

NEW MEXICO STATE
COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS,
Hobbs, N. Mex., May 25, 1955.

NATIONAL HELLS CANYON ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIRS: The following resolution has been adopted by the New Mexico State Council of Carpenters at a special meeting held in Santa Fe, N. Mex., April 30, 1955:

"Whereas the Hells Canyon is the last major hydroelectric multipurpose project in the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas the erection of a federally financed dam would develop the hydroelectric potential of the site by providing water for irrigation, navigation, and maximum amount of flood control; and

"Whereas much of the recent growth of the West is the result of the development of such sites and all parts of the Nation have benefited from the growth of the West by expansion of industries in these undeveloped areas: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the New Mexico State Council of Carpenters in special meeting in Santa Fe, N. Mex., assembled, do hereby endorse the Hells Canyon Dam project and passage of Senate bill No. 1333 by Congress. Motion to adopt made and seconded. Motion carried by unanimous vote."

VERNON C. ROBERTS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

LOCAL UNION, NO. 610,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Port Arthur, Tex., May 19, 1955.

NATIONAL HELLS CANYON ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIRS: We of Carpenters Local 610 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, A. F. of L., of Port Arthur, Tex., at a special called meeting, voted unanimously to submit the following resolution. We hope you will give it much consideration.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it is a well-known fact that Hells Canyon represents the last great natural dam site in the Nation; and

Whereas it has long been expected that a big multipurpose dam was to be built with Federal funds, much as Grand Coulee Dam and other great Columbia River developments were built, which would develop the full hydroelectric potential of the site, as well as provide water for irrigation, navigation, and a maximum amount of flood control; and

Whereas now we are confronted with the fact that certain interests wish to turn over the Hells Canyon Dam site to private interests for the construction of a series of low dams that would provide electricity only; and

Whereas these low dams would not even produce the full hydroelectric potential of the site, much less use the full possibilities of the site for navigation, recreation, irrigation, or flood control; and

Whereas Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, along with 29 other Senators, has introduced Senate bill 1333, which will provide for the construction of the big multipurpose dam at Hells Canyon as originally proposed with Federal funds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Carpenters Union, A. F. of L., Local 610, of Port Arthur, Tex., go on record as being in favor of the big multipurpose dam as provided by Senate bill 1333 because we feel that this type of dam will best serve all the interests of our country.

Sincerely yours,

B. H. SHARP,
Recording Secretary,
Carpenters Local No. 610.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 15, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution passed by Oregon State Grange in annual session June 6 to 10 submitted for your consideration;

"Whereas Senate bill 1333 authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress; and

"Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill for the following reasons: First, that it will tie in with the Northwest power pool to insure needed power for this area and for national defense; second, that it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means; third, that it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry and encourage industry and make jobs for thousands and thousands of people. These added industries, this added payroll, added homes, and other benefits all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State, and county governments; fourth, that it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction with interest, and thereafter be a source of income for governmental operations; and fifth, that we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low-cost power in the Northwest; and

"Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America and feeling that our congressional delegation is in need of home support for this measure: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Oregon State Grange go on record as heartily supporting this Hells Canyon Dam bill as originally outlined in Army engineers report No. 308 and that we forward copies of this resolution to all Senators and Representatives of the Northwest States requesting their undivided support of Senate bill 1333.

ELMER MCCLURE,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

S. 609. A bill to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons; with an amendment (Rept. No. 622).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 636. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; with amendments, together with minority views (Rept. No. 624).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6239. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 623).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1739. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 627);

S. 1741. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A. National Memorial, Inc., in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 628); and

S. 2176. A bill to repeal the requirement that public utilities engaged in the manufacture and sale of electricity in the District of Columbia must submit annual reports to Congress (Rept. No. 629).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 2177. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the declaration of stock dividends by public utilities operating in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 630).

By Mr. MCNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 665. A bill to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act (Rept. No. 631); and

S. 666. A bill to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 632).

By Mr. MCNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 1825. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center (Rept. No. 626).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 1275. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions (Rept. No. 633).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 182. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 634).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 48. A bill to provide for the disqualifications of certain former officers and employees of the District of Columbia in matters connected with former duties; without amendment (Rept. No. 625).

AMENDMENT OF MINING LAWS RELATING TO MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF SAME TRACTS OF PUBLIC LANDS—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. 554)

Mr. MALONE submitted minority views on the bill (S. 1713) amending the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, which were ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2288. A bill to protect consumers and others against failure to identify misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2289. A bill for the relief of David Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2290. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2291. A bill for the relief of Albino Braiuca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2292. A bill for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2293. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, to provide benefits for the wives and minor children of such individuals, to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and to provide extra credit for postponed retirement; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2294. A bill for the relief of Maria Veronica de Pataky, Coloman de Pataky, Oscar Beregi, Oscar Beregi, Jr., and Margreth Leiss von Laimburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2295. A bill to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to tobacco allotments;

S. 2296. A bill to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to tobacco allotments; and

S. 2297. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2298. A bill authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a certain contract with the Toston Irrigation District, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS REPRESENTATION ACT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to protect consumers and others against failure to identify, misbranding, and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2288) to protect consumers and others against failure to identify, misbranding, and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. GOLDWATER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

The proposed Textile Fiber Products Representation Act requires the identification of the fiber content of fabrics used or intended for use in "articles of wearing apparel, costumes and accessories, upholsteries, draperies, floor coverings, furniture, furnishings and beddings, and other domestics." In addition the law requires that advertising set forth the fiber content of such articles.

The act's jurisdiction covers all transactions in commerce, from manufacturing to retailing. The act specifically exempts individuals who are merely transporters of such articles in commerce, processors, under contract, of such articles, and any person manufacturing or shipping such articles to foreign countries.

A textile fiber product is misbranded if it is falsely or deceptively identified; or if the identification does not show (1) the fiber or fibers in the product, by generic name or nondeceptive trademark in the order of predominance; (2) the percentages of all fibers present in an article when one fiber is 20 percent or less by weight of the total fiber content, exclusive of permissible ornamentation up to 5 percent. Mention of a fiber present in an amount of 5 percent or less is prohibited. This provision is designed to prevent the use of the name of a "miracle fiber" when the fiber is present in a negligible amount.

The advertising provision of the law requires that ads must show the fiber or fibers in a product in the order of predominance by weight; must set forth the percentages of all fibers, when one is present in an amount of 20 percent or less; and must not use the name of a fiber which is present in the amount of 5 percent or less; and generally prohibits any misrepresentation or deception with respect to the identification of the fiber content of a textile fiber product.

This law does not require the identification of a fabric or floor covering which is removed from a labeled bolt of fabric or floor covering. Textile products contained in a package need not be individually labeled, providing the package is labeled in accordance with the act.

The act is to be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission, and the Commission is given powers of injunction and to certify actions to the Justice Department when there is reason to believe that a misdemeanor has been committed. Guaranties are provided for which relieve an individual of liability. The types of guaranty provided for are the separate guaranty, the continuing guaranty filed with the Commission, and a continuing guaranty given to the buyer, but not filed with the Commission.

Exceptions to this act are headwear, footwear, handbags, luggage, brushes, lampshades, and toys. Further, the Commission is given the power to specifically exempt articles which in its discretion should not be covered by the act. This is in addition to the general authority of the Commission to exempt articles which are of an inconsequential and insignificant nature.

The Wool Products Labeling Act is specifically repealed.

AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL BANKS TO UNDERWRITE CERTAIN LOCAL SECURITIES

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, and also a statement on State and Local Government Financing of Public Facilities and Improvements which has been prepared to indicate some of the major points which may be involved in the consideration of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2290) to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes, introduced by

Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statements presented by Mr. BRICKER are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

I have today introduced S. 2290, a bill designed to assist cities and States by helping to create the broadest possible market for the bonds which they must issue to finance needed public facilities and improvements, and thus permit cities and States to obtain the lowest possible interest costs.

This is a matter of important public concern—particularly to the public officials who are responsible for the management of our State and local governments. The United States Conference of Mayors at its recent session of the full Conference unanimously adopted a resolution supporting such legislation. The American Public Power Association also adopted such a resolution at its convention in May of this year. In recent testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, it received the support of representatives of the American Municipal Association. I am informed that members of the Executive Committee of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of America have indicated their support of such legislation. The principle of this legislation is also supported by the American Bankers Association, having been approved by both the Legislative and Administrative Committees of that organization.

There is good reason for the interest and support of these public officials and organizations in this legislation. They are faced with an increasing volume of non-Federal public works construction which is required to meet the present and future needs of their States and communities. In 1950 the construction of such public facilities and improvements amounted to $6.6 billion. The official estimate of the United States Department of Commerce for 1955 is $10 billion.

This is a tremendous increase in the last 5-year period. But present and future needs are so large that the United States Department of Commerce estimates that in the 10-year period 1955 to 1964 a total of $204 billion would be required—a yearly average of $20.4. The 1955 estimate of $10 billion represents an increase of $1.4 billion over 1954. If that amount of increase continued each year over the next 10-year period, the total would rise to more than $15 billion a year in 1960, and the total for the entire 10-year period would be approximately $149 billion. Thus the State and local governments face an increase of from 50 to 100 percent over the 1955 $10-billion annual rate of public improvements to be financed.

The yearly average annual rate of about $20.4 billion expenditure by State and local governments for needed public facilities and improvements over the 10-year period 1955–64 would consist of approximately the following: roads, $9.2 billion; schools, $4.2 billion; hospital and other medical facilities, $2.2 billion; water and sewer facilities, $2.5 billion; and other public works (such as parks, prisons, auditoriums, offices, playgrounds, publicly owned gas, power, and transit systems, etc., $2.3 billion.

It is recognized that these data are not absolutes. They are estimates based on informed judgments, and they may vary upward or downward from actuality. But it is unlikely that such variations as may occur would significantly diminish the magnitude of the problem of necessary public improvement financing which our State and local governments face in the relatively immediate future.

The bill which I have introduced simply makes it clear that national banks may underwrite and deal in obligations issued by the States and political subdivisions thereof, or agencies thereof which are eligible for purchase by a bank for its own account. Except in the case of general obligation bonds of States and local governments (which the banks are now authorized to underwrite and deal in without regard to the 10-percent limitation), the bill would provide that no bank shall at any one time hold obligations as a result of underwriting, dealing, or purchasing for its own account in a total amount with respect to any one issuer in excess of 10 percent of its capital stock actually paid in and unimpaired and 10 percent of its unimpaired surplus fund. Thus, the only change in the present law is to make it clear that national banks can underwrite and deal in nongeneral obligation or revenue bond type of public securities which are of such quality that the banks could buy them for their own account. In the case of nongeneral obligation or revenue-type bonds, the banks would be subject to the 10-percent limitation which I referred to a moment ago. Consistently with the legislative history of the Glass-Steagall Act, obligations issued by State and local governments which are payable solely from special assessments against benefited property would not be included within the underwriting authority.

In view of these considerations, it might be expected that a bill relating to an area of such important public concern to our States and municipalities would be relatively noncontroversial. I do not understand that such is the case with respect to the bill which I have introduced. Under such circumstances, it would be unreasonable to expect action to be taken on the bill during this first session of the 84th Congress by the Committee on Banking and Currency or by the Senate. But this certainly does not mean that consideration of this matter should be permanently deferred. I am convinced that the important public issues which I believe are involved in this matter should be brought up on the table where they can be openly studied and freely discussed, pending the convening of the second session of this 84th Congress, by all who have an interest in this problem. Thereafter, early during the next session, the Committee on Banking and Currency can schedule open hearings on the bill, during which the merits of the proposed amendment can be subjected to democratic process of free and open discussion, and, on the basis of such discussion and the evidence presented to the committee in the course of the public hearings, the Committee on Banking and Currency can decide whether the proposed amendment should be recommended for favorable consideration by the Senate.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCING OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS

GENERAL

State and local governments must issue and sell in the competitive market public securities to obtain the capital funds to finance the construction of the various types of public facilities and improvements (such as schools, hospitals, roads, water and sewer systems, etc.) required to serve the needs of their citizens. The broader the market for such public securities, the more assurance there is that State and local governments will be able to obtain lower interest rates.

In the past, the vast majority of needed public facilities and improvements were financed by State and local governments through the issuance and sale of public securities known as "general obligation" bonds—principally bonds the payment of which is secured by ad valorem taxes levied on all the property within the jurisdiction of the issuing State or local government. As to such general obligation bonds, State and local governments have always had the benefit of commercial bank participation in the marketing of their bonds, since the banks have always had clear authority to underwrite and deal in this type of public security.

With the development of new forms of State and local government financing, however, the proportion of the total issues of public securities which are of the very highest grade but which are "nongeneral obligation" in form has been increasing at an accelerated rate. As a result State and local governments are being deprived of the benefit of commercial bank participation in the marketing of a constantly increasing proportion of their required financing because at present the banks are not authorized to underwrite and deal in nongeneral obligation or revenue bonds.

BENEFITS OF PRESENT COMMERCIAL BANK PARTICIPATION

Within the present statutory limitations imposed upon their authority, the commercial banks discharge an important public-interest function in helping to create the broadest possible market for bonds issued by State and local governments to finance needed public facilities and improvements.

While the number of commercial banks which engage in underwriting bonds issued by State and local governments is relatively small, these banks have more than 30 percent of the total banking capital of the Nation. Thus the commercial banks which do engage in underwriting these bonds can make a most important contribution toward supplying the funds required by State and local governments to finance necessary public facilities and improvements. During the years 1949 to 1953 it is estimated that commercial banks underwrote more than one-third of the total of all general obligation bonds issued by State and local governments. The availability of the capital power of the commercial banks for the underwriting of general obligation bonds issued by State and local governments broadens and strengthens the market for these public securities and materially benefits the States and their political subdivisions through lower interest rates obtainable through increased competition and also benefits the investing public by enhancing the liquidity and marketability of these bonds.

The participation of the banks in this field has been in the public interest in that—

1. It has broadened the market for State and local government securities and thus reduced the cost of public improvements.

2. In addition to their direct assumption of underwriting responsibilities, the banks have encouraged the organization and growth of small investment banking firms specializing in municipal securities, who have benefited from their favored treatment in underwriting syndicates under bank management.

3. It has enabled the banks to maintain departments capable of advising on local financing policies—advice for which State and local officials normally turn to the banks.

4. The policies and standards of State and local government finance thereby have been improved since the banks have a sense of responsibility to taxpayers and investors because of their own status as public instrumentalities. Further, the banks are subject to State banking departments, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, all of which exercise supervision and regulation of the conduct of their business and the quality of their investments.

PRESENT LIMITATIONS

Section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (the National Bank Act as amended in 1933 and thereafter) defines the powers of banks to deal and invest in securities, providing generally that dealing shall be limited to purchasing and selling as agent for customers. This limitation however does not apply to certain exempted securities, principally the obligations of the United

States Government and its agencies and the "general" obligations of any State or of any political subdivision thereof. Accordingly, banks may buy and sell these exempted securities as principals for their own accounts or for the account of others. These exemptions continued in effect the powers possessed by the banks prior to 1933, to underwrite and deal in public securities.

THE NEED FOR AMENDMENT

While the banks have always underwritten public securities, they have been limited to "general" obligations of the States and local governments. Since 1939, "general" obligations have been construed by the supervisory authorities as including only those obligations secured by ad valorem taxes on real property (notwithstanding that, prior to 1939 and consistently with the legislative history of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933, the supervisory authorities had held since 1934 that banks were permitted to underwrite and deal in revenue bonds of the Port of New York Authority and the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority which issued only one class of security to which all net revenues were pledged and which, therefore, were held to be general obligations of the issuer).

As a result, with the new forms of public borrowing which have developed, there are many high-grade revenue bonds issued by State and local governments for self-supporting public improvements or on the security of specifically pledged tax receipts. The banks cannot now underwrite these public securities. The change in methods of public financing is resulting in the loss of the availability of the capital power of commercial banks for underwriting a generally increasing proportion of financing required of State and local governments to carry out necessary public facilities and improvements, and the need for such underwriting power is increasing with the wider use of special purpose issues. This is clearly illustrated in the following table (using the totals compiled by the Daily Bond Buyer) which shows that during the most recent 3 year period 1952–54 the proportion of the total of all State and local government financing which was nongeneral obligation in form and therefore not eligible for bank underwriting was more than 35 percent. In 1954, the proportion of nongeneral obligation State and local government financing reached 46 percent of the total.

	Total new issues, State, municipal, and agency	General obligations	Nongeneral	Percent, nongeneral to total
1945	$818,781,000	$615,382,000	203,399,000	24.8
1946	1,203,557,000	997,697,000	205,860,000	17.1
1947	2,353,771,000	1,968,081,000	385,690,000	16.4
1948	2,989,731,000	2,440,230,000	549,501,000	18.4
1949	2,995,425,000	2,312,472,000	682,953,000	22.8
1950	3,693,604,000	3,093,681,000	599,923,000	16.2
1951	3,278,153,000	2,548,058,000	730,095,000	22.3
1952	4,401,317,000	2,937,967,000	1,463,350,000	33.2
1953	5,557,887,000	3,990,641,000	1,567,246,000	28.2
1954	6,953,304,000	3,738,923,000	3,214,381,000	46.2

The 46.2 percent of the total of 1954 State and local government financing which was non-general obligation in character amounted to $3,214,381,000. Of this amount, 128 issues totaling $1,774,377,000—about 55 percent—were eligible for purchase by commercial bangs for their own account. Under the proposed amendment of section 5136 of the revised statutes, as amended, these obligations would also be eligible for bank underwriting, as well as for bank purchase. A list of these 1954 State and local government issues is attached hereto.

In this connection, it is to be noted that many of the revenue bond issues for new construction projects which, under the proposed amendment, would not be eligible either for bank purchase or bank underwriting at the time of original issue, would later become eligible as proven earnings records were established. As a result, bank underwriting would, in many cases, be available when it became desirable to refund or refinance the original bond issues.

These data evidence the great and constantly growing need for an amendment to afford State and local governments the assistance of bank underwriting of public securities of this type.

INCREASING USE OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

When the Glass-Steagall Act was enacted by Congress there were few public authorities in existence in this country. Since that time, however, the use of public authorities as a means of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements has become widespread and many types of securities are now being issued by these authorities which were unknown in the year 1933. Many of these obligations are payable, indirectly, by the levy of ad valorem taxes levied throughout the State or throughout a political subdivision of the State. These obligations, while issued in the name of the authority, for all practical purposes are the obligations of the State or of the political subdivision for the benefit of which the bonds were issued. Obligations of this character are now being issued in many parts of the country. A few examples may be cited to show the character of the obligations and their intrinsic merit.

The State Bridge Building Authority of Georgia is authorized to build bridges and lease them to the State highway board for a rental sufficient to pay the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of the bridges and the debt service requirements of the bonds issued for their construction. The security of these bonds, therefore, for all practical purposes is the cerdit of the State of Georgia. Similarly, the State School Building Authority of the State of Georgia is authorized to construct school buildings and to lease them to various political subdivisions at a rental sufficient to pay the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of the buildings, and the debt service of the bonds issued to construct them. In addition to the obligation to pay the rental being a general obligation of the political subdivision which leases the school buildings, the law requires the State board of education to pay, directly, to the authority so much of the State aid which is allocated to such political subdivision as may be necessary to meet the rental payments, so that for practical purposes the bonds of the authority are secured by the general credit of the political subdivision which leases the buildings, as well as by moneys, raised by general taxation throughout the State of Georgia, which are allocated to such political subdivision.

In the same State, the State office building authority and the State hospital authority are authorized to construct office buildings and hospitals and to lease such buildings and hospitals to the State at a rental sufficient to pay the cost of operation and maintenance of the buildings and the debt service of the bonds issued for their construction. The credit of the State of Georgia is, therefore, indirectly pledged for the payment of these bonds.

In Kentucky, the State property and building commission is authorized to issue bonds for the purpose of constructing buildings to be leased to State agencies, and the Kentucky Highway Authority is authorized to issue bonds for highway purposes payable solely from rentals derived from leases of these properties to the State highway department. As the obligation of the State to pay these rentals is a general obligation of the State of Kentucky, it is evident that, indirectly, the credit of the State of Kentucky is the security for these bonds. In the State of Michigan, joint city-county building authorities are authorized to issue bonds for the purpose of erecting public buildings to be leased to joint governmental units. The obligation to pay the rentals is the general obligation of the governmental units which lease the buildings and, therefore, indirectly the general credit of these governmental units is the security for the payment of the bonds. In Pennsylvania, the general State authority, the State public school building authority, and the State highway bridge authority are authorized to issue bonds to finance the construction of bridges, tunnels, highways, school buildings, and many other types of public improvements, and to lease these improvements to the State or to political subdivisions at an annual rental sufficient to provide for the payment of the bonds.

The Florida State Improvement Commission is authorized to issue obligations for the construction of various types of public improvements and to lease such improvements to the State or to any political subdivision of the State at an annual rental sufficient to provide for payment of the principal and interest of the bonds.

There is attached hereto a summary statement of various types of public authorities which issue revenue bonds secured by leases, etc.

Many obligations of this type are securities of the very highest grade. For all practical purposes they are the obligations of the lessee of the improvement for which the bonds were issued, and were it not for the fact that the bonds are issued in the name of the lessor rather than in the name of the lessee, they would be eligible securities for bank underwriting and investment. Their exclusion from the class of eligible securities is due to form and not to substance.

Moreover, in recent years a number of the States have issued bonds which are not general obligations but for the payment of which are pledged the avails of a specific tax, such as the gasoline tax, sales tax, tobacco tax, and automobile license tax. The reliability and sufficiency of these taxes over a period of years is a matter of public record, and it is not necessary to make a further pledge of the general credit of the issuer in order to give these bonds a high investment quality. For a variety of reasons there is a persistent trend toward the issuance of such bonds. This type of governmental financing was not usually resorted to in the United States as early as the year 1933.

THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE GLASS-STEAGALL ACT OF 1933 SHOWS THAT SUCH OBLIGATIONS WERE NOT INTENDED TO BE EXCLUDED FROM BANK UNDERWRITING

The debate upon the Glass-Steagall Banking Act in the Senate clearly demonstrates that Congress was willing to permit banks to underwrite and invest in bonds of the States and of their political subdivisions, with the exception of bonds which were payable, solely, from special assessments levied upon property located in the portion of the subdivision presumed to be specially benefited by the improvement to finance which the bonds were issued. Such bonds were not regarded as sufficiently safe and liquid to make them desirable securities for bank investment or underwriting, but there is nothing in the debate which would indicate that Congress was of the same opinion with respect to any

other type of public security. What Congress was concerned with as to public securities was whether the securities were sound and liquid, and not with the means provided for their payment. Consistently with this legislative intent of the Congress, the proposed amendment would not permit bank underwriting of bonds payable solely from special assessments levied upon specially benefited property.

THE INVESTMENT QUALITY OF REVENUE BONDS

Revenue bonds which banks would be permitted to underwrite pursuant to the proposed amendment (i. e., State and local government obligations which qualify for bank investment) would be generally comparable in investment quality to the general obligations of State and local governments which, under the present statutory limitation, banks are now permitted to underwrite.

It has been suggested by some that revenue bonds as a class are of a generally lower investment quality than general obligation bonds. In support of such suggestion, resort is made to a comparison of the ratings given by Moody's Investors Service to general obligation bond issues of $5 million or over issued over the 5-year period from 1949 to 1953 with revenue bonds issued during the same period. Such a comparison, however, does not accurately reflect the facts which are pertinent to forming a reasoned and intelligent judgment on this point.

The lack of a Moody's Investors Service rating of a bond issue is not evidence of poor quality. The proportion of revenue bonds not rated by Moody's is due to the fact that most of them were very large issues. The large unrated issues number only 2 percent of the number of loans financed during the years 1949–53, and emphasis on this small number of borrowers merely distracts attention from the fact that hundreds of small communities which borrow for improvement of their water, gas, electric, and sewer systems need the help of their local bankers far more than the major borrowers. Most of the unrated construction loans of the past 5 years have been for the construction of toll roads, but there is another large and growing classification of nongeneral obligations, particularly those secured by leases payable from general fund revenues of States and municipalities.

Further, during the period 1949 to 1953, a very large percentage of revenue bond issues of $5 million or over were issued for the construction of toll highways, toll bridges, and other construction projects. Moody's does not ordinarily rate such bonds. A much fairer comparison is obtained by considering the ratings given by Moody's Investors Service to the general obligation bonds and revenue bonds of the same issuers. Moody's 1954 Manual lists 131 municipalities which have issued both general obligation bonds and revenue bonds. For 29 of these municipalities all revenue bonds were rated higher than the general obligation bonds. For 79 municipalities many revenue bonds had the same rating as general obligations, others were given higher ratings, and a few were given lower ratings. In only 23 municipalities were the revenue bond issues all rated lower than the general obligations. Equally interesting is the fact that of the 178 various purpose groups of revenue bonds rated under the names of these 131 municipalities, 3 revenue credits are rated AAA, 47 are rated AA, 74 are rated A, 50 are rated BAA, all within the usually accepted standard of investment quality; and only 4 are rated BA.

This comparison refutes any suggestion that revenue bonds, as a class, are inferior in investment quality to general obligation bonds. There are, of course, differences in the investment quality of revenue bonds. The same is true of general obligation bonds. It is evident, however, from this comparison of Moody's ratings that the revenue bonds of any issuer may have an even higher investment quality than the general obligation bonds of that issuer.

RELATIONSHIP TO TRUST ACCOUNTS

During more than 20 years of major participation in the underwriting of general obligation bonds of State and local governments, the banks have scrupulously observed sound practices with respect to the investment of trust funds in State and local government bonds.

Throughout the United States it is a fundamental principle of common law as interpreted by the courts, that a trustee may not benefit itself or any affiliate in administering trust funds. In many States this rule is specifically stated in the statutes. For example, in New York State banking law, article 3, section 100-b, there appears this line: "But no corporate fiduciary shall purchase securities from itself." Regulation, F of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System relating to trust powers of national banks contains in section 11, paragraph (a), "Funds received or held by a national bank as fiduciary shall not be invested in stock or obligations of, or property acquired from, the bank or its directors, officers or employees, or their interests, or in stock or obligations of, or property acquired from, affiliates of the bank."

Banks which have been active in dealing in State and local securities have followed the rule that they will not buy bonds of an issue underwritten by the same bank, or an affiliate, until the original distribution is completed so that the trustee bank has no further interest in the sale of bonds by the underwriting syndicate. As a rule, this abstinence does no harm to a trust or its beneficiaries since the unlisted market for State and local securities at any given time offers an extremely wide choice of credits running 1,000 or more in number, while any given trustee bank through its underwriting department would ordinarily be participating in not more than 5 percent of the number of different credits. For example, "The Blue List of Current Municipal Offerings" of January 14, 1955, included offerings of 1,028 different issuers totaling $279,387,038 in amount.

In specific cases in which the trust department of a given bank has a special interest in a forthcoming offering of bonds, the underwriting department of that bank refrains from participation. This is a matter of judgment just as in the case of any other conflict of interest. The record shows that in case of any conflict with customer relations, the commercial banks always subordinate their security sales business.

From the viewpoint of the investor, the approval of a municipal credit by a commercial bank underwriter is the greatest possible assurance of quality; first because the commercial bank is closely supervised and restricted by the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Board in its own judgment of quality; and second, because the underwriting commercial banks follow the criterion that they will offer to customers only those credits which they accept as satisfactory for their own investment.

THE AMENDMENT WOULD PROMOTE THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Amendment of the present statutory limitations to permit bank underwriting of nongeneral obligations issued by State and local governments which qualify for investment of their own capital funds would encourage increased competition. Such increased competition would facilitate State and local government financing of necessary public improvements on better terms.

It has been suggested that bank capital is not needed in revenue bond financing. In support of such suggestion it is said that there is no known instance where the lack of available dealer capital has been responsible for the abandoning of a project by a governmental authority.

This is not the basic point. The merits of the need for amendment cannot be fairly tested on the basis of whether bank capital is essential to any particular underwriting—the real test is whether bank participation would enable such loan to be made more advantageously—on better terms. The experience of States and municipalities in selling their general obligation bonds has proved that the broadest possible competition for such issues tends to lower financing costs. No matter who underwrites the bonds of a particular issue, its marketability is the better for having had the benefit of this broader interest. Assuming that one syndicate acts in complete good faith in appraising the value of a public-bond issue; if another syndicate can be organized to compete, its members because of a different approach or more confidence in the market, or greater capital power, may place a higher valuation on the issue and thus underwrite at lower cost to the borrower.

CONCLUSION

State and municipal finance is not static, and it is neither logical nor reasonable to regard as immutable congressional legislation affecting it. The Glass-Steagall Act, like any other law, should be constantly reexamined by Congress in the light of changing conditions, and there has been a remarkable change in conditions since the year 1933. The proposed amendment does not involve any drastic change in that act, nor any change in its fundamental purpose. On the contrary the proposed amendment would carry out the original purpose of the Glass-Steagall Act in the light of developments in the field of public finance since the year 1933.

STATE, STATE AGENCY, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVENUE BONDS ISSUED IN 1954 WHICH ARE ACCEPTABLE FOR BANK INVESTMENT AND WOULD HAVE BEEN ELIGIBLE FOR BANK UNDERWRITING UNDER THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5136

Department water and power, city of Los Angeles, Calif., $9,000,000.

Salt River project agricultural bonds, $5,000,000.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa, sewer revenue bonds, $1,000,000.

Corpus Christi, Tex., water works revenue, $2,715,000.

Glendale, Calif., electric works revenue, $1,000,000.

Daytona Beach, Fla., water and sewer revenue, $5,330,000.

Carlisle Area Joint School Authority, Pennsylvania, $3,640,000.

Jefferson County, Ky., school revenue, $3,940,000.

Muncie, Ind., sewer revenue, $3,600,000.

McMinneville, Tenn., water and sewer revenue, $1,000,000.

Muskogee, Okla., water works improvement bonds, $2,000,000.

Lubbock, Tex., water works system revenue, $1,000,000.

Monroe, La., water and electric revenue, $1,620,000.

Jones Beach State Parkway Authority, $40,000,000.

Birmingham, Ala., water work board revenue, $4,000,000.

State school building authority of Georgia revenue, $32,512,000.

Lawrence, Kans., water and sewer system revenue, $3,000,000.

Corpus Christi, Tex., water works and sewer revenue bonds, $8,900,000.

Tacoma, Wash., light and power revenue, $5,000,000.

Upper Moreland School District Authority (Pa.), $1,000,000.

Tucson water revenue, Arizona, $3,110,000.

Falls Township School District Authority (Pa.), $3,450,000.

Fort Worth, Tex., water and sewer revenue bonds, $3,000,000.
Detroit, Mich., sewage disposal system revenue bonds, $2,000,000.
Omaha public power district electric revenue, Nebraska, $12,000,000.
Bloomington, Ind., water works revenue, $1,500,000.
Austin, Tex., electric, water and sewer revenue bonds, $15,000,000.
Purdue University revenue, Indiana, $10,250,000.
Michigan highway revenue, $10,000,000.
Cleveland, Tenn., water and sewer revenue, $1,000,000.
New Chicago, Ind., water revenue, $1,100,000.
South Bend, Ind., sewerage works revenue, $17,000,000.
Lexington, N. C., natural gas system revenue, $1,035,000.
Board of Regents, University of Utah, $1,800,000.
Central Dauphin County Joint School Authority (Pa.), $2,520,000.
Board of Regents of Kansas building revenue, $2,000,000.
Portland, Maine, water district, $1,300,000.
Port of New York Authority, $20,000,000.
Atlanta water works revenue (Ga.), $2,200,000.
Livonia, Mich., water supply system revenue, $1,500,000.
Los Angeles department of water and power, $15,000,000.
New Jersey Turnpike Authority 3s (second series), $27,200,000.
Bowling Green State University, Ohio, $2,350,000.
Rome, Ga., water and sewerage revenue bonds, $1,000,000.
Lafayette, Ind., sewer revenue bonds, $4,550,000.
Chicago, Ill., parking facility, revenue bonds, $4,900,000.
Detroit, Mich., sewage disposal system revenue, $3,722,000.
Metropolitan Utilities District, Omaha, water revenue, $6,000,000.
Pennsylvania State Highway and Bridge Authority, $20,000,000.
Connecticut expressway revenue and motor fuel tax bonds, $100,000,000.
El Paso, Tex., water and sewer revenue, $3,000,000.
State Teachers College Board, Indiana, $2,856,000.
Florida State Improvement Commission Revenue, $6,000,000.
County of Jefferson, Ky., school building authority revenue, $1,385,000.
Jacksonville, Fla., municipal parking revenue, $4,000,000.
Rockville, Md., water and sewer revenue, $1,300,000.
Georgia State Bridge Building Authority, $10,250,000.
Erie Sewer Authority revenue (Pennsylvania), $5,300,000.
Palmyra Boro Authority sewer revenue (Pennsylvania), $2,150,000.
Knoxville, Tenn., water revenue, $1,000,000.
Pasadena, Calif., electric works revenue, $6,000,000.
Saginaw, Mich., sewer revenue, $5,000,000.
Des Moines, Iowa, sewer revenue, $1,000,000.
State Board of Education, Florida, $26-692,000.
San Francisco Harbor revenue (California), $5,600,000.
New York State Thruway Authority revenue, $300,000,000.
University of Texas dormitory revenue, $3,042,000.
State Roads Commission of Maryland, $1,290,000.
Board of Water and Sewer Commission Mobile Revenue, Alabama, $6,000,000.
Lakeland, Fla., light and water revenue, $3,500,000.
Kokomo, Ind., sewer revenue, $1,250,000.
General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, $30,000,000.
Jackson, Ohio, first mortgage water works revenue, $1,100,000.
Haverford Township (Pa.) School District Authority revenue, $3,525,000.
Granite City, Ill., sewerage bonds revenue, $1,335,000.
North Texas Municipal Water District revenue, $9,200,000.
Bradenton, Fla., utilities revenue, $2,200,000.
Salt Lake City Suburban District revenue, Utah, $6,000,000.
Consumers Public Power District revenue, Nebraska, $2,250,000.
Manitowac, Wis., electric bonds, $1,250,000.
Henderson, Ky., water and sewer revenue, $2,100,000.
Tampa, Fla., hospital revenue, $4,500,000.
Gainesville, Fla., public improvement revenue, $1,000,000.
Lower Colorado River Authority, Texas, $27,000,000.
Puyallup, Wash., sewer revenue, $1,000,000.
Kansas City, Mo., Broadway bridge revenue, $13,000,000.
State Roads Commission of Maryland, $25,000,000.
Elkhart, Ind., sewer revenue, $2,400,000.
Chelan County Public Utility District No. 1, Washington, $8,600,000.
St. John the Baptist Parish, La., gas and water revenue, $1,760,000.
St. James Parish, La., water revenue, $2,220,000.
Department of water and power of Los Angeles revenue, $19,500,000.
Jersey City Sewerage Authority revenue, New Jersey, $22,000,000.
Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District, Kentucky, $8,000,000.
Bald Eagle Joint School Authority revenue, Pennsylvania, $2,050,000.
West Snyder County School Authority, Pennsylvania, $1,185,000.
Shelby, N. C., natural gas, $1,200,000.
Louisiana State Building Authority, $3,750,000.
Ohio major thoroughfare construction bonds, series "A" (fuel tax), $30,000,000.
Clarksburg, W. Va., Water Board, first lien water revenue, $1,776,000.
Lafayette, La., utility revenue, $3,000,000.
Wyoming Township, Mich., water revenue, $1,000,000.
Orlando, Fla., public-improvement revenue, $3,000,000.
Thomasville, Ga., gas revenue, $1,500,000.
Greenwood, S. C., public-utility revenue, $1,600,000.
Denton, Tex., electric revenue, $4,300,000.
Hollywood, Fla., sewer revenue, $4,150,000.
Kansas City, Mo., water revenue, $12,000,000.
Cleveland, Ohio, waterworks revenue, $6,000,000.
Cleveland, Ohio, electric revenue, $5,000,000.
Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, $7,200,000.
Alexandria Sanitation Authority, Virginia, $8,200,000.
Holland, Mich., water-supply system revenue, $2,700,000.
Colorado Springs, Colo., water, electric, and power revenue, $10,000,000.
Wheeling, W. Va., sewer revenue, $2,500,000.
Florida State Board of Education, $16,542,000.
Maryland State Road Commission, $180,000,000.
Board of Water and Sewer Commission, Mobile, Ala., $4,000,000.
State Public School Building Authority, Pennsylvania, $23,610,000.
New York State Thruway Authority, $50,000,000.
Orlando Utilities Commission, Florida, $4,000,000.
San Jose, Calif., offstreet parking revenue, $2,450,000.
Louisiana State Building Authority, $2,500,000.
Florida State Improvement Commission revenue, $3,400,000.
Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, $12,500,000.
Department of Waterworks of Hammond, Ind., $3,600,000.
New York State Power Authority, $335,000,000.
Corpus Christi, Tex., sewer-improvement revenue, $1,365,000.
Total, $1,774,377,000.
Issues, 128.

DESCRIPTION OF VARIOUS PUBLIC AUTHORITIES WHICH ISSUE REVENUE BONDS SECURED BY LEASES, ETC.

GEORGIA STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds are secured by a prior lien on rentals received from county boards of education and governing bodies of independent school systems within the State pursuant to lease agreements. The rentals, payable each September 1, are sufficient to pay interest and retire bonds at maturity, to provide hazard reserve for insurance, maintenance reserve and operating funds. The State board of education, a party of all lease agreements between local units and the authority, pays the above rentals on behalf of local units directly to the authority.

GEORGIA STATE BRIDGE BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds are payable from pledge of rentals derived from lease to State highway department of certain bridges. Annual rentals cover debt service and cost of operating and maintenance costs of said bridges.

GEORGIA STATE OFFICE BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds secured by prior lien on revenues received from various State departments and State agencies. Rentals to be charged each lessee, $3.50 per square foot annually, subject to increase if inadequate, are payable quarterly until October 15, 1978 or retirement of bonds, whichever is later.

GEORGIA STATE HOSPITAL AUTHORITY

Bonds secured by revenues from rentals and income received under terms of leases to the State board of health. Lessee agrees to pay quarterly an amount equal to bond requirements and reserve therefor.

STATE HIGHWAY AND BRIDGE AUTHORITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Bonds are secured by pledge of rentals payable by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania covering projects leased by the authority to the Commonwealth at annual rentals sufficient to meet the annual principal and interest requirements.

GENERAL STATE AUTHORITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Bonds secured by pledge of all rentals payable by State of Pennsylvania from its current revenues under leases covering projects leased by the authority to the State, which leases are to provide for payments at annual rentals sufficient to meet annual principal and interest requirements.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds secured by pledge of leases between authority and certain school districts and which the school districts are obligated to pay out of their current revenues including taxes and reimbursements from the State. Rentals on all leases pledged are sufficient to cover 122 percent of the principal and interest requirements on all such bonds.

MARYLAND STATE ROADS COMMISSION

Bonds are secured by an annual tax consisting of such amounts as may be necessary of—(a) the proceeds of the 2-percent excise tax on the issuance of certificate of title for motor vehicles, and (b) a 50-percent share of the gasoline-tax fund allocated to the commission.

LOUISIANA STATE BUILDING AUTHORITY

State law provides for servicing of authority's bonds and prior charges from proceeds of the 1.47-mill State ad valorem tax on all taxable property within the State after payment of principal and interest on certain bonds of the State.

OKLAHOMA PLANNING AND RESOURCES BOARD

Bonds are secured solely from pledge of revenues from park system earnings as follows:

1. Specified minimum lease rentals from concessionaires or specified percentages of lessees' gross revenues, whichever is greater.
2. Gross revenues of facilities operated directly by the State, and
3. Pledge of State to collect, to the extent when necessary when receipts from (1) and (2) are insufficient, admission fees to improved areas of each and every State park.

DETROIT-WAYNE JOINT BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds payable from proceeds of fixed annual rentals by the city of Detroit and by Wayne County in amounts sufficient to pay interest and principal.

ALABAMA AGRICULTURAL CENTER CORP.

Bonds secured by pledge of resources of special agricultural center fund into which are deposited rentals paid by agricultural center board. Bonds carry an additional pledge of amounts, if needed, from a special agricultural fund deposited in the State treasury.

ALABAMA BUILDING CORP.

Bonds secured by leases to various State departments and agencies. Current debt service constitutes a prior claim on rentals, ahead of all other claims.

ALABAMA STATE DOCKS BOARD

Bonds secured by pledge of lease agreements with the city of Mobile. There is provision for accrual and maintenance of a reserve fund sufficient to pay principal and interest for 24 months in advance and for use of part of earnings under certain conditions for retirement of bonds.

FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

Bonds issued on behalf of counties and special districts are secured by the unit's distributive share of a statewide 2-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline and other motor fuels, and are further secured by full faith, credit, and taxing power of the local unit.

FLORIDA STATE ROAD DEPARTMENT

Bonds are secured by leases of the various properties to the State of Florida. In the majority of cases the rental obligations are equal to aggregate debt-service requirements on lessor bonds issued in acquisition of the projects. All rental contracts between the department and the various instrumentalities provide for purchase by payment of the rentals; title to vest in the State on completion of the payments.

ILLINOIS ARMORY BOARD

Bonds are secured by leases of armories and assigned to a trustee. All rentals under these leases are paid directly by the State to the trustee, to be used for payment of principal and interest.

LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Bonds are secured as to payment solely by an irrevocable dedication of an amount sufficient to pay principal and interest on the bonds and any required reserves from the annual franchise tax on corporations levied by authority of the State legislature.

MAINE SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY

Bonds secured by lease agreements with town and community school districts providing for rentals to be paid by the communities sufficient to pay principal and interest on certain administrative expenses. Further provision is made that if the municipality is delinquent in payments to the authority the State department of education "shall make payments to the authority in lieu of such town, city, or community school district from any amount properly payable to such town, city, or community school district by said department."

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO TOTAL DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, to provide benefits for the wives and minor children of such individuals, to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and to provide extra credit for postponed retirement. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2293) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, to provide benefits for the wives and minor children of such individuals, to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and to provide extra credit for postponed retirement, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. KENNEDY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

I am introducing today a bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a system of flexible retirement. Specifically, my bill would amend the old-age and survivors insurance law in three ways:

1. To lower from 65 to 60 the age at which women—as workers, spouses, or widows—become eligible for social security benefits.
2. To enable workers forced to retire before age 65 due to a permanent and total disability to become eligible immediately for retirement benefits; and
3. To increase a worker's benefit by 2 percent for every year that he postpones his retirement past age 65.

FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT

Before discussing each of these parts individually, I would like to say a word about the age of 65 in our social security laws. Under the influence of these laws 65 has become institutionalized as the age of retirement in industry and elsewhere. A deplorable number of industries have established compulsory retirement systems which require withdrawal from the labor force at that age, no matter how able and willing a worker might be. Our statistical studies lump those in the age brackets above 65 under the single term "the aged." Yet there is no magic in the number 65, and to apply this single chronological age as a standard by which all individuals are to be measured, regardless of their physical and mental age, is unrealistic and impractical. Some must retire before age 65; others should be encouraged to postpone their retirement to a later date.

The three amendments I am introducing today—each of which I have proposed in previous years—are designed to meet this problem. The total level premium cost for this bill, in terms of a percentage of payroll, is considerably less than 2 percent, an increase which could be easily met once such a bill is enacted by adjusting the present schedule for increasing the contribution rate.

First, we must lower the social security eligibility age for women from 65 to 60, if we are to modernize the law on the basis of more up-to-date statistics. Both public and private studies have indicated that 60 is the retirement age for women under many of our industrial pension and compulsory retirement plans; and women forced to retire under such programs, or who become unemployed at that age, are generally unable to secure new employment, particularly with companies who establish age qualifications for employment. As a result, these women workers are forced to find other means of support for the 5-year period before their social-security payments will begin. Similarly, such studies indicate the tendency of American men to marry women several years younger than themselves; and to require women to be as old as their husbands in order to receive a spouses benefit is thus both unrealistic and discriminatory. The identical problem faces widows who must wait until age 65 before becoming eligible for social security survivors benefits. Many of them receive benefits while they have children under the age of 18. But these benefits end when the last child passes that age, and do not begin again until the widow reaches age 65, creating a gap in their income which appears capricious and arbitrary.

Secondly, we must enable workers forced to leave their jobs before the age of 65 because of a permanent and total disability to receive the retirement benefits for which they have paid at that time. Disability—which is included in practically every other social-security program in the world, including our own civil service, Armed Forces, veterans, railroad retirement, and many of our State and local public employees programs—is the most serious gap in our social-security laws today. If a worker is forced to retire because of old age, he receives benefits. If he loses his job before the age of 65, he gets unemployment benefits. If he dies before the age of 65, leaving an aged widow or dependent children, his survivors get benefits. But if he is forced to retire before the age of 65 because of disability, he gets nothing, even though he has contributed to social security since that system began.

I received a letter recently from a 60-year-old constituent, with a wife and young daughters, who was forced to retire because of a back injury. Although he had been assured for nearly 20 years that the social-security contribution deducted form his paycheck was like savings in the bank, he now finds himself unable to draw upon those savings for 5 years. Like 19 out of 20 disabled workers, his injury was not work connected and cannot qualify him for workmen's compensation. For the next 5 years, he will be forced to rely upon what few savings he has left, and then upon the charity of his community and friends. He needs his social-security benefits now far more than he would at age 65—for his children are still growing and his medical expenses are heavy. Ironically enough, if he had died as a result of his injuries, his family would have received benefits immediately—but his disability, which adds an extra dependent and extra expenses, brings them nothing.

For these reasons, I urged the Congress to adopt the recommendation made in 1938 by the Social Security Advisory Council (whose members included the present Under Secretary of the Treasury, Marion Folsom); the 1948 recommendation of the Social Security Advisory Council appointed by the Republican 80th Congress; and the 1955 recommendation of the Commission on Chronic

illness, in a report approved by representatives of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association, and others, including insurance interests. Such legislation passed the House of Representatives in 1949; but was restricted by the Senate to the public assistance program, a program which will become continually more expensive to the taxpayers as the number of disabled in an increasingly aged population grows.

A program of disability insurance, as proposed in my bill, would be fairer to our disabled workers who now lack all protection; fairer to the taxpayers who must pay for a program that should be equally borne by the payments of the employees and employers themselves; and fairer to those employers now bearing the total cost of disability provisions in their pension and welfare plans. There is, moreover, the danger that failure to meet this problem will increase pressures for a general reduction in the retirement age for all persons, a proposal which, if adopted, would deplete the social-security trust fund and run counter to our social and economic needs.

Previous objections to such a program have been removed, first, by experience under the other Federal disability programs mentioned and most recently under the disability freeze provision adopted by Congress 1 year ago. Under this program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the cooperation of the American Medical Association, has established a medical advisory committee to process the applications of those permanently and totally disabled individuals who wish to have their social-security benefits frozen—without reduction for years of idleness—until they reach age 65. The freeze, of course, does not provide any income for the disabled worker during those difficult years before he reaches age 65.

Once his own resources are totally exhausted, he may, if he wishes, seek public assistance or private charities; but this is hardly designed to encourage his rehabilitation and decent living standards. My amendment, building upon the medical certification provisions already in the law under the disability freeze, would fill this deplorable void.

Third, Congress should increase—by 2 percent under my bill—a worker's benefit for every year that he postpones retirement past age 65. Such an amendment would encourage a more flexible retirement age instead of institutionalizing the age of 65; and it would encourage those who have reached that eligible age to stay on the job. Those workers who postpone retirement after age 65—who are contributing to the fund instead of drawing from it are saving the system money. But by doing so they are reducing the level as well as the value of their own ultimate benefits, in view of census data indicating the sharp decline in average wages after age 65. If, by providing a slightly higher benefit, we can encourage more workers to stay on the job at advanced ages, we will reduce the burden on the trust fund, or the public-assistance programs and/or the families of older workers' burdens which have increased sharply in the 20th century as the life span increases while opportunities for older workers decline. The average worker today can anticipate nearly twice as many years in retirement as his 1900 counterpart, nonproductive years which must be paid for from his savings or from the savings of others. Surely it would be wiser to utilize the skills of these older workers—who constitute a large share of urgently needed craftsmen and foremen—than to force them into the lower living standards and purchasing power of retirement.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT OR NEAR ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement which I have prepared, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2298) authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill., introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the city of Rock Island, Ill., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island Ill., and to a place at or near the city of Davenport, Iowa," approved March 18, 1938, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The city of Rock Island Ill., or any State or political subdivision thereof which may have acquired the bridge constructed pursuant to the subsection (a) of this section, is hereby authorized, subject to the prior approval of the plans by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, to reconstruct and enlarge such bridge, and to reconstruct, enlarge, and extend the approaches to such bridge including, but not limiting the generality of the foregoing the altering, widening, laying out, opening or constructing of any streets, avenues, or boulevards within or without any municipality deemed necessary by said city, or any State, public agency, or political subdivision that may take over or acquire said bridge in order to provide adequate traffic regulations and approach or approaches to said bridge."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act of March 18, 1938, is amended by inserting "(including reconstructing, enlarging, and extending such bridge and its approaches)" after "and its approaches."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act of March 18, 1938, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches (including the reasonable cost of reconstructing, enlarging, and extending such bridge and its approaches) under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion of the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of such bridge and its approaches as provided in subsection (b) of the first section of this act. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated in accordance with such arrangement as may be agreed upon by the city of Rock Island, Ill., or its assigns, and the State highway departments or other appropriate agencies of the States of Iowa and Illinois. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; the expenditures for reconstructing, enlarging, and extending the same; and all of the daily tolls collected shall be available for the information of all persons interested."

The statement presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The great quad-city area composed of Rock Island, Moline, and East Moline, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, is divided by the Mississippi River. More than 200,000 people reside within this area and cross and recross the Mississippi River in going to and from their employment and pursuits. There is a large volume of through traffic which goes through these cities. In 1938 the Congress passed legislation permitting the construction of a bridge across this river and permitting toll charges to pay for the bonded indebtedness. Since that date traffic along and upon the bridge has increased manyfold—and particularly truck traffic—to an estimated 414,000 trucks in 1954. Other vehicular traffic aproached 3,600,000 for 1954.

The area must meet the increased demand now made upon it, and I am therefore introducing a bill which will amend the 1938 act by permitting an additional widening of the approaches to the bridge and repairs upon the bridge to permit a free and uninterrupted flow of traffic through this area and to provide special routes around the city of Rock Island for the heavy truck traffic which uses the bridge.

Sufficient safeguards are incorporated within the bill to insure a reasonable toll charge and for the proper application of the funds received for the retirement of the bonds and the ultimate opening of the bridge for free usage.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE AMERICAN SUGAR PRODUCERS (S. DOC. NO. 56)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements made yesterday on the floor of the Senate with reference to the sugar problem be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed this question with the able Senator from Wyoming, and I am informed that he has talked with the minority leader about it. The majority leader has no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2188) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that the Federal Government shall pay a portion of the costs of certain works of improvement constructed for purposes of water conservation, and that the bill be referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In explanation of this request, let me say, that I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] that the bill comes appro-

priately within the jurisdiction of that committee. I am informed by the distinguished parliamentarian that he concurs, and that a mistake was made in the original reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1956 — ADDITIONAL CONFEREE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] be appointed an additional conferee on the part of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Address delivered by Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, before the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, in Denver, Colo., on June 17, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statements by himself and Judge Samuel Rosenman, special counsel for the New York Power Authority, regarding contract between the Aluminum Company of America and New York Power Authority.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ronald N. Davies, of North Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of North Dakota, Vice Charles J. Vogel, elevated.

George S. Register, of North Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of North Dakota, to fill a new position.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Wednesday, June 29, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

UNITED NATIONS ATOMIC RADIATION STUDY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, it was gratifying to learn from the newspapers this morning that Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge announced at the United Nations meeting in San Francisco, on yesterday, that at the General Assembly meeting in September, the United States will propose a U. N. study of the effects of radioactivity on living things.

As some Senators may recall, on April 13 I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, calling for such a study. Twenty-seven other Senators, including eight members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, cosponsored that resolution. The American Federation of Scientists, which is strongly in favor of such a U. N. study, also endorsed the resolution.

Although the Senate has not yet had an opportunity to act on the resolution, it is good to know that the administration has decided to go ahead with such a study. I feel that Ambassador Lodge's announcement will do much good. However, I would still like to see the Congress adopt Senate Concurrent Resolution 22. There then would be no possible doubt in the minds of neutral nations and our allies that the United States was solidly behind this proposal once again to exert our moral leadership in world affairs.

It is my firm belief that the proposal will give the United States an opportunity to alleviate much of the fear of nuclear devices and the suspicion of itself which are so common in many parts of the world today. Although many questions concerning the effects of radioactivity on living things are as yet unanswered, the work of the Atomic Energy Commission indicates that at the present time there is no reason for alarm.

But since many nations, particularly those of Asia, do not share this view, it is entirely proper that the United States should forthrightly declare itself in favor of making an international study. This is the best proof we can possibly give of our humanitarian motives and the fact that no nation need fear that the United States will ever, either intentionally or unintentionally, use its mighty atomic power for any purpose but to defend itself in time of war and to advance the welfare of mankind in time of peace.

Finally, cooperation among nations in meeting what could some day be a serious threat to all men can, perhaps, help pave the way to the solution of more complex political problems. If the Soviet Union refuses to cooperate fully and sincerely in this matter, that will be another indication to the entire world of her utter disregard for the peace and security of all mankind.

Since the text of Ambassador Lodge's remarks is not available today at the State Department, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES URGES FALLOUT DATA WORLD POOL—LODGE PROPOSES U. N. INVESTIGATE EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR TESTS ON HUMANITY

SAN FRANCISCO, June 21.—The United States announced here tonight it will propose that the United Nations assemble all the world's available information on the effects of nuclear radiation from atomic tests "so that all nations can be satisfied that humanity is not endangered by these tests."

Such accumulated data, said Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., American Ambassador to the U. N., "could set at rest unjustified fears, combat sensational distortion in the light of truth, and lead to humanity's learning how to deal best with problems of atomic radiation."

Lodge declared "the best scientific information known to us shows that properly safeguarded nuclear testing, in contrast with nuclear warfare, is not a threat to human health."

The United States move came on the eve of Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov's scheduled address to the U. N. commemorative meeting here Wednesday morning. Diplomats have reported that Molotov, in private discussions here, has been talking about a ban on nuclear tests.

The American proposal had been approved in advance by Britain and several other nations, including Sweden, it was learned here. The proposal will be offered formally when the U. N. General Assembly meets next in September.

The United States has resisted both domestic and foreign pressures to call off further nuclear tests. Lodge's statement tonight made no mention of further American tests, but the idea of them was implicit.

Geneticists have been warning of the danger to human life, especially of the effect on future generations, if the world's atmosphere is further loaded with radioactive fallout from thermonuclear explosions.

The Atomic Energy Commission, however, regards these fears as exaggerated and Lodge reaffirmed this attitude. The U. N. conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy, to be held in August in Geneva, will also consider the effects of radiation on humanity.

Lodge said that while much scientific data on the question exists and the United States is "making intensive studies" of the problem, such material from all nations has "not been collated."

Therefore, he said, the United States proposed "that these data from all countries should be assembled so that all nations can be satisfied that humanity is not endangered by these tests.

"We believe that the United Nations can perform an important service in undertaking to bring this about. The best place to assemble all available information is the United Nations. We think that the next General Assembly should establish a procedure to receive and assemble radiological information collected by the various states as well as the results of national studies of radiation effects on human health and safety."

Some American and foreign scientists have suggested that the U. N. should set up a test monitoring unit so the world would know who was setting off explosions. Since it is scientifically possible to detect by a reading of the air the vital facts concerning all but the smallest of nuclear tests, it is argued that such a monitoring system would keep the world alerted.

Both the United States and Britain have given advance notices of their tests. But much of the world's knowledge of Soviet tests have come from scientists who have monitored Russian explosions.

FREE DISTRIBUTION OF THE SALK POLIO VACCINE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to refer to an editorial which, at the request of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, on page 8577. The editorial is entitled "Socialized Nonsense,"

and was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 16.

Mr. President, in direct contradiction of that editorial is an editorial entitled "Party Differences," which was published in the Arizona Republic, of Phoenix, Ariz., on June 18. I ask unanimous consent to have the latter editorial printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTY DIFFERENCES

The basic difference between Republican and Democratic economic philosophy was well illustrated, we believe, in this week's congressional debate over distribution of Salk vaccine. The Republicans, led by President Eisenhower, supported a bill that would appropriate $35 million to give free polio vaccine to every child who couldn't afford to pay for it. Many Democrats, led by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, supported a bill that would appropriate $135 million to give free polio vaccine to every child, regardless of whether the child's family could pay for it or not.

We think President Eisenhower's plan is the one that will be adopted. For compelling as the "gimmie" philosophy may be, we don't believe the average Congressman wants to use public funds to give vaccine to those who can well afford to pay their own physicians for the shots. Such a step would obviously be in the direction of socialized medicine. It could lead to the Federal Government's assumption of all medical costs, not only those of Salk vaccine shots.

While the privately run National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis was administering the vaccine on a test basis, it was only natural that the inoculations be administered free. Now that the aim is to immunize everyone under 19 years of age, the job should be done by the Nation's doctors on a regular, professional basis, with the exception, of course, of those who cannot afford to pay for the shots. They should—and will—be taken care of.

There is another aspect of the Salk vaccine program that requires consideration. The United States Health Bureau has discussed the possibility of greatly enlarging its inspection facilities in order to be able to guarantee that all vaccine comes up to a prescribed level. This is not a proper function of government. The Bureau of Health should draw up the specifications, and should take proper action against manufacturers who ignore them. But it should not take on the job of inspecting every batch of vaccine made, any more than the Government should assume the task of inspecting every pound of meat sold in the Nation to be sure there is no violation of the pure-food laws. Government regulation is one thing. Direct control is another.

Government has its legitimate tasks to perform, and they don't include giving everyone in the country Salk inoculations, or inspecting every vial of vaccine that is manufactured. The Republicans understand this. The Democrats probably understand it also, but the urge to build ever larger bureaucracies is one the Democrats seem to have great difficulty in controlling.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there is a difference. I think the editorial in the Arizona Republic shows very clearly the difference in thinking which exists throughout the Nation, particularly between the West and the East.

I should like to read a portion of the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, as follows:

But there is hardly anything subversive in a proposal for free vaccine under which the Government would pay private laboratories for the material and private doctors would continue to be paid for their services. To call this socialized medicine is to render that much abused term even more ridiculous than it has already become.

I should like to comment that there is nothing subversive about socialism. Many groups in this country are advocating it in one form or another. I do not recognize it as being subversive. I think we can recognize it on all hands for what it is.

On the other hand, commenting on the same subject, the Arizona Republic said:

Such a step would obviously be in the direction of socialized medicine.

Because there is that difference, I took the trouble to look up the definition of socialized medicine in the dictionary. In Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary the following definition is given for "socialized medicine":

Administration by an organized group, a state or a nation of medical and hospital services to suit the needs of all members of a class or classes or all members of the population, deriving funds from assessments, philanthropy, or other sources. Often identified with one particular form, state medicine (which see).

When we look up "state medicine" in the same dictionary, we find the following definition:

Administration and control by the National Government of medical and hospital services for the whole population, medical and hospital personnel being employed by the government and funds raised by taxation.

The purpose of the bill which caused these comments, Senate bill 2147, is stated as follows:

To provide all children an equal opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis.

The bill does not say who is to pay the cost, but it is to be inferred that the United States Government would have to do so, in order to stay within the meaning of the bill.

I make these remarks at this time because it is clearly evident that there is a misconception as to what the term "socialized medicine" or "socialism" means, as defined in the city of Washington by the Washington Post and Times Herald, and in the State of Arizona by the Arizona Republic.

Mr. LEHMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, millions of people in this country are deeply concerned over the confusion, the doubts, and the fears which have been aroused because of the unhappy situation which unfortunately has developed during the past 2 months in connection with the production, distribution, and use of the Salk vaccine. We still do not know where the responsibility for the disappointments and the failures with which we have been confronted lies. We still have not enacted legislation which would make this vaccine available to every child in the country between the ages of 1 and 19, free of charge, without invoking a means test, which would be both unworkable and socially evil.

We have failed to do many other things which we should have done weeks, and perhaps months, ago. On the other hand, Canada has proceeded in this field in a thoroughly orderly manner. It has made safe vaccine available free of charge. It has made it perfectly clear that the distribution and the use of vaccine does not in any way involve socialized medicine, as charged only 2 weeks ago by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Mrs. Hobby—a charge which called forth an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald accurately characterizing Mrs. Hobby's testimony as "socialized nonsense."

The Washington Post and Times Herald of June 19 carried another very illuminating and interesting article entitled "How Canadians Solved the Polio Vaccine Problem." I believe this statement should be carefully studied, not only by Members of Congress, but by the people of the United States generally. They will find it most informative. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CANADIANS SOLVED POLIO VACCINE PROBLEM

(By Earl Ubell)

OTTAWA, June 18.—Canada has met the problem of the Salk polio vaccine with foresight, readiness, and action.

But government officials who ran the program disclaimed any special aptitudes as they talked with this correspondent this week.

"Touch wood," said Paul Martin, Minister of Health and Welfare. "Nothing happened to our 800,000 vaccinations. It might have if we weren't careful. I've pounded our scientists with safety, safety, safety."

"We were lucky," said Dr. G. D. W. Cameron, Deputy Minister for Health. "We double-tested all our vaccine. We accepted some American-made stuff which, to our surprise, was not. We might have taken more."

"Please, I don't want any comparisons made between Americans and Canadians," said Dr. R. D. Defries, head of the University of Toronto's Connaught Laboratories that made all Canadian vaccine. "We did everything the Americans did, nothing more."

It developed, however, that the Canadians did do some things that the United States did not do in its vaccine program. Perhaps it is because they dealt with a total population of 15 million instead of the 165 million in the United States.

FREE TO ALL

They distributed the vaccine free to all children. They had 1 manufacturer instead of 6. They made the vaccine in small, easy to control batches. They were ready to move in with polio medical teams in case of a vaccine accident. They double safety-tested every batch. They made only 26 batches.

Probably the most important factor was the government's insistence on safety testing by its new $1 million virus laboratory here headed by Dr. Fred Nagler. It caught four batches with live virus that had slipped by Connaught Laboratories' safety tests.

"We figured it out," said Dr. Nagler, "our double check increased our safety factor 24 fold over what had been suggested by American regulations." In the United States the Government accepted manufacturers

safety tests and spot-checked samples submitted.

The Canadian virus laboratory has a staff of 30 working full or part time on the polio testing program. The United States Laboratory of Biologics Control had 45 persons on its staff as of April 30, 1955, when the Cutter incident broke and when most of the 6 million shots had moved out of the commercial factories.

FEWER BATCHES

The Canadian service could do the laborious and expensive double-testing because the number of batches was small and it was dealing with a single manufacturer whom it knew intimately. The Canadians also improved the test-tube tissue tests by a variation known as additional sub-culturing.

Furthermore, Connaught made its vaccine in small batches of about 120 quarts each, compared to the 1,500-quart batches of American commercial manufacturers. The mathematical probability of finding live virus in a small batch is greater than in a large one with a single test.

It is something like trying to fish 1 of 30 guppies out of a bathtub with a small net, or trying to get 1 of 5 out of a pail with the same net.

At present, the Canadians are undecided whether to adopt the new safety standards established by the United States Public Health Service. Mr. Martin said they are under consideration; Dr. Nagler said the present Canadian methods may be modified.

PLANS LAID EARLY

But aside from the extra scientific precautions the Canadians took, they laid their plans for manufacture and distribution 6 months before April 12, when Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., brought in his report that the vaccine was safe and up to 90 percent effective.

In October Mr. Martin and Dr. Cameron met with the 10 provincial health ministers. They knew Connaught had been making live virus to be killed in the States by commercial manufacturers for the vaccine field trial.

Rather than let the Connaught operation lie fallow, the Governments decided to give the university laboratory $500,000 for enough vaccine for 750,000 children to be distributed free. Half the cost would be borne by the Provinces, the rest by the central ministry.

So Connaught (pronounced with the accent on the first syllable) tooled up and made the vaccine according to the formula set down by Dr. Jonas Salk, the developer, and followed the provisional requirements established by the United States Health Service.

With the care characteristic of a university laboratory, Connaught adhered strictly to Dr. Salk's formula. It "cooked" the live virus in formaldehyde an average of 9 days, although in the States commercial manufacturers have been known to "cook" for 15 days.

The United States Health Service contended recently that in the hands of the manufacturers, the vaccine does not follow the Salk mathematical equations. A Connaught scientist told me that generally the process, if carried out with precise measurement and control, did go by the formula. Dr. Nagler, however, showed me graphs in which there were slight departures.

COST IS LOW

Connaught made enough vaccine for 800,000 children at $1.25 for a series of three shots. The cost is expected to drop soon to 75 cents, and another laboratory at the University of Montreal will be in business by autumn.

Mr. Martin said that by the end of March 1956, 3 million Canadian children will have received either their full or primary vaccination. This is 60 percent of children under 16. All 800,000 children in Canada's first and second grades have aready received two shots.

At present the central government and the Provinces are considering whether to continue inoculations during the summer when polio is at its peak. In Canada, where there are between 2,500 and 8,500 cases a year, the disease characteristically concentrates in specific Provinces.

"I don't think we'll give the first shots during the summer," Dr. Cameron said. "We'll start up again in the fall with boosters and primary vaccination."

NOT STATE MEDICINE

Plans for the vaccination program were made both at the October meeting and again in January. The local and Federal ministers decided to go ahead with the vaccination even if Dr. Francis reported the vaccine as having a low effectiveness but high safety. They wanted to continue the scientific work.

The ministers also decided to set up flying teams of polio specialists to follow up any accidents from vaccination. This proved to be a good move. One case that followed vaccination was shown not to be polio; another postvaccination case was demonstrated to have begun before injection. "Public hysteria was averted," Mr. Martin said.

Mr. Martin vigorously defends his free-vaccine program.

"That is not State medicine," Mr. Martin, himself a recovered polio victim, said. "Polio is a communicable disease, and control of such diseases is a Government responsibility. Besides, we have in this country a long tradition of supplying certain drugs and vaccines free. We give streptomycin to TB victims."

So far, no public or medical opposition has developed in Canada against the vaccine program, probably because the Health and Welfare Ministry plays such a big part in Canadian life.

This Ministry spends $1,200,000,000 a year, including family allowances, and it is the biggest item next to defense in the Canadian budget. The United States spents $2,500,000,000 a year, the sixth highest agency budget.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment, supplementing what the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] said earlier today, regarding an editorial on Secretary Hobby, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

As I announced the other day, before the week is over, I shall make a major speech on the polio vaccine question. However, I thought the observations made this morning by the Washington Post and Times Herald were particularly penetrating and that the editorial should be published in the body of the RECORD.

I do not believe this administration should be allowed to cover up what I think is the sad record it has made on the polio situation. I would suggest to Secretary Hobby and to the Surgeon General that if they do not know the facts which developed from an experience with a polio vaccine in 1931, they should acquaint themselves with them. In 1931 Dr. John Kolmer, of Temple University, produced a polio vaccine which did not have very desirable results. It was vaccine, I was informed by a prominent medical authority this morning, which made use of live virus, with some results which certainly were unfortunate.

In view of that experience, it seems to me that the American public had the right to expect Mrs. Hobby and the Surgeon General to use exceptional caution in making certain that not one batch of polio vaccine containing live virus would get into the channels of commerce.

As I was advised this morning, Dr. Kolmer's experiment with live virus produced exactly the disastrous results which followed the use of the Salk vaccine when it was not adequately tested so as to prevent any live virus vaccine from getting out of the laboratories.

I shall discuss the Kolmer experiment later in the week, and I shall also discuss other information which has been given to me by medical authorities and which leaves no room for doubt in my mind that Mrs. Hobby and the Surgeon General have much to answer for in connection with inexcusable mistakes which have been made in the antipolio program.

TRANSPORTATION IN THE MAILS OF LIVE SCORPIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1716 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after the second paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to permit the transmission in the mails, under regulations to be prescribed by him, of live scorpions which are to be used for purposes of medical research or for the manufacture of antivenin. Such regulations shall include such provisions with respect to the packaging of such live scorpions for transmission in the mails as the Postmaster General deems necessary or advisable for the protection of Post Office Department personnel and of the public generally and for ease of handling by such personnel and by any individual connected with such research or manufacture. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the transmission in the mails of live scorpions by means of aircraft engaged in the carriage of passengers for compensation or hire."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the transmission in the mails of live scorpions."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May I inquire of the Senator from Arizona whether or not the amendment of the House is purely a technical amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me say to the distinguished minority leader that the House amendment prohibits the shipment of live scorpions by airline. The amendment is perfectly agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent

for the present consideration of House bill 6295, which has just come over from the House of Representatives, in order that it may be amended in certain particulars to correspond with a bill already passed by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", it is proposed to strike out "$13" and insert "$12", and on page 3, after line 18, to add the following new section:

SEC. 4. Section 4 of said act is amended by striking the figures "4 cents" and "7 cents" and inserting "6 cents" and "10 cents", respectively, in lieu thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that these amendments merely restore the language contained in a similar bill already passed by the Senate, and are for the purpose of getting the bill into conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. The House bill, as amended, is the same as the bill already passed by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6295) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY MAURINE NEUBERGER AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE LIBERAL PARTY IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 25, 1955, Oregon State Representative Maurine Neuberger made a speech at the annual dinner of the Liberal Party in New York City. I am particularly pleased that Mrs. Neuberger, who is the wife of the junior Senator from Oregon, on that occasion paid tribute to the illustrious junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and to his qualities of democracy, friendliness, and courage.

Mrs. Neuberger has made an exceptionally brilliant record in the Oregon State Legislature. As one reads her speech, one can well understand why she enjoys such a very fine reputation as a wonderful legislative leader in the State of Oregon.

Because I would like to associate myself with the remarks she made, not only with regard to the junior Senator from New York, but also in regard to the issues which she dealt with in her speech, I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor Wagner, Governor Harriman, Lieutenant Governor de Luca, and friends, it is bound to be a disappointment to you to come to this fine occasion expecting to hear a United States Senator and get in his place a lowly member of the lower house of the Oregon Legislature. It is sort of like ordering rare roast beef and getting plebeian hamburger—too well done.

I don't want you to consider me a substitute for my husband, and I don't speak for him. He is the member of the family who has the ideas, the know-how, and is the real politician.

However, many of the issues and problems which are of paramount interest to you are of equal importance to us in Oregon and to people everywhere. In fact, I had lunch with your own Senator LEHMAN from this State a few days ago and I was flattered when he asked me questions about my own work in the Oregon Legislature. I thought to myself, "This is the mark of a fine man, that he is trying to show some interest in my humble position." But, as we talked, we found that our experiences in working at the State level often dovetailed. He showed me a yearbook of some of his veto messages and I had to laugh when I saw that the New York Legislature had had a bill dealing with muskrats. We had one very similar just a few weeks ago.

I am especially pleased to be on the same program with Governor Harriman, because I have followed the Governor's defense of Niagara Falls for all the people of New York State rather than for private monopolies. That is our fight at Hells Canyon. Cheap electricity, as a result of the great Federal power development in our area, has contributed to our national defense, and to increased industry—that means our people are earning more and paying more into the Federal Treasury through income tax—and to our own material comforts. I have lived on a farm—all my girlhood. I know what it means not to have electricity. Not until F. D. R. and Senator Norris put through Bonneville Dam and the Rural Electrification Administration did we have electric lights. Can you recall what it is like to have no electric refrigerator, to cook over a wood stove, no hot water by merely turning a tap? Now we have all those things, all the usual electric appliances, and electric milking machines. Our farm electric bill runs between $6 and $8 a month.

One of my particular fields in the legislature is education. I was a teacher for many years before I was married. During this session we watched the National Congress with particular interest to see what aid they could give to our many distressed school districts. By distressed, I don't mean that they are poor. They are merely suffering—or profiting—from a 49-percent increase in population in the last 10 years and can't keep up with the need for school buildings. The President's program fails utterly to meet our needs. Great fanfare heralded the proposal, yet it added up to virtually nothing. Even our Republican-dominated legislature saw that the so-called Federal aid would be of no help to us. It seemed to propose aid to banks, rather than to schools, by making it easier to borrow money at banker's rates, which are higher than those we are already using.

Dick's criticism of the handling of the Salk vaccine program has been widely reported in your own papers. I join him in criticism and in calling attention to the contrast exemplified in the Canadian program. We have spent a great deal of time in Canada, gathering story material and have observed their political system with interest. We have no desire to leave the land of our birth and allegiance and go to Canada, but when a neighbor has "built a better mousetrap," so to speak, it doesn't hurt to take a look and see how it works. On April 12, 1955, the Minister of National Health and Welfare in Ottawa was able to announce a comprehensive national program which had been developed in advance, in contrast to our hit-and-miss approach.

RESOURCES OF THE WEST ARE A NATIONAL HERITAGE

There are many wonderful things to do and see in New York, but one of the advantages of living in the West is our accessibility to rugged mountain vistas and outdoor living. Such a memorable trip was one that Dick and I made a couple of years ago over the Lewis and Clark Trail in the rugged wilderness area of central Idaho. It was a thrilling experience to know that we were actually walking over the same trail that those intrepid explorers trudged 150 years ago. We knew where we were going, but they didn't. Many times on that trip I said to myself, "It's a wonder to me that the Oregon Country ever got discovered." But, as Dick has written in a story about that trip, a lesson could be learned. Did Lewis and Clark claim the resources of the West for all Americans, through the endless years to come, or for a handful of men to profit from as their own property? On the timbered summit of Lolo Pass, we were looking at some of the same resources seen by Lewis and Clark—although those men knew nothing of the mystery of hydroelectric power lurking in those swift moving waters that led to the Columbia River. They couldn't possibly have envisioned the importance of those vast stands of pine and fir and spruce to our national economy of this year of 1955, 150 years later, but it is for those very issues, among others, that my husband made his decision to run for the United States Senate, and I in my small way to run for the Oregon Legislature.

I am called upon a great deal to speak before women's groups. When I do, I make it a point to say "I'm a politician." They know me as a teacher, a housewife, a writer, and photographer. But I want them to think of me as a politician. Many of them have never seen one in the flesh before and they have the picture drawn by the cartoonist of a man with a large stomach, covered by a plaid vest, and smoking a fat cigar. They think of him as an ominous character. I hope that when they see me, an average person, they will understand that politics is the art of government. That our deliberations, either on the State or national level, affect their daily lives. Whether they will be able to buy colored margarine, have adequate schools for their children, have abundant cheap electricity, be sure of a supervised plan for polio control, or even musk-

rat control. This is the business of the politician and of the people. I am sorry that new duties in Washington force me to leave the active field because politics is important and politics is fun.

FACING NEW PROBLEMS ON FOREIGN POLICY—THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I prepared for delivery in the Senate a speech on facing new problems on foreign policy and the role of the United Nations. However, I delivered the speech on Monday, June 13, at the Northwest Institute of National Relations in Portland, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACING NEW PROBLEMS ON FOREIGN POLICY—THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(Speech by Senator WAYNE MORSE before Northwest Institute of International Relations, Monday, June 13, New Lincoln High School Auditorium, Portland, Oreg.)

It was 10 years ago on June 26, 1945, that the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco. Ten years is not a long span of time in history. But it is long enough to make the United Nations one-half as old as was the League of Nations at the outbreak of World War II. The time has come when we might appropriately consider whether the United Nations serves our national interest and promotes world peace.

When the General Assembly convenes this fall in New York, it must decide whether to call a conference to review the United Nations Charter. That will afford an opportunity to take a look backward to see where we have been and to look ahead to see where we are going. It is well for us to consider at this time what has happened to the United Nations in its first 10 years of life, especially with reference to the attitudes of the American public toward it.

American attitudes toward the United Nations have gone through three distinct phases.

First, immediately after the war, there was great hope for the future of the organization and tremendous emphasis on its potentialities as a device to preserve peace. This might be described as the period of the great illusion—the illusion that the United Nations was more than the sum of its parts—that is, as an institution, was capable of vastly greater achievement than the member states themselves.

The second phase was the period of great disillusionment. It was the period when Americans realized with a shock that the United Nations could not control the cold war, that atomic weapons could not be brought under international control, that international police forces were not to be established. It was during this period that the World Federalists were most vigorous in pressing their case. Some 20 State legislatures adopted resolutions calling for a strengthened United Nations, and the United States Senate by a 64-to-4 vote adopted the Vandenberg resolution which proposed strengthening the United Nations in several respects.

The third phase is the status into which we have moved in the last few years. This phase is characterized by generally rational attitudes toward the United Nations. Most Americans realize the capacities of the U. N. as well as its limitations. They realize that it bridges the cold war in some ways and may serve to lessen tensions in the world. Yet they realize that it cannot bring a definitive peace in a world split by the fundamental ideological conflict between democracy and communism.

The period is also characterized by the existence of fringe groups whose attitude toward the U. N. is characterized by irrationality. Strident voices of isolationism attack the United Nations. I propose to direct my remarks at the attacks these groups direct at the U. N.

One reason for recent attacks on the United Nations is that there has been too much emphasis on what the United Nations has not done and not enough emphasis on what it has done. Critics have resorted to the familiar technique of the wild charge, the unsupported allegation, the deliberate lie. Organized groups which attack the United Nations have created the impression that they are far more numerous than they are. They try to silence the rational people in a community by the techniques of slander and by declaring themselves the only true patriots.

It is time for the rational people of the community to meet these attacks head on. Before the attacks of these groups can be answered, however, we must understand them. Those who attack the U. N. cannot, of course, be put into one category. Some of them are unreconstructed isolationists. They still believe that all foreigners are bad and that internationalism is something dangerous. But some attack the United Nations today because they do not like to live in a troubled world and they are searching for a scapegoat, someone to blame for an uneasy peace. Strangely enough many of these people find two scapegoats. The first is communism, and the second is the United Nations. Some of those opposed to continued American participation in the United Nations as presently organized blindly lump the United Nations and communism together. They seem to believe that the United Nations is dominated by its Communist membership. Either the Communists must be kicked out of the United Nations or the United States should withdraw, they cry.

I do not believe that either of these approaches to the United Nations and to American participation in it are in our national interest. Those who back these positions promote misconceptions of all kinds. I propose to explore some of these misconceptions. I hope that one effect of my remarks to this group will be to encourage you to give battle to the half-truths and distortions which are the stock in trade of those who blindly attack the United Nations.

KOREA AND THE U. N.

First, there is the misconception about Korea. The charge is made that the war in Korea was a United Nations war and that the U. N. dragged the United States into that war.

The facts are just the opposite. If the war in Korea had not been fought under United Nations auspices, I have no doubt but what the United States would have been required to fight alone. Secretary of State Dulles is on record on this point. He recently told the Foreign Relations Committee, and I quote him, "I believe that the vital interests of the United States would have justified our taking this action alone, if we had had to."

It was United States forces in Japan that would have been outflanked by Communist control of South Korea. It was the United States defense line in the Far East that would have been breached if the war in Korea had moved southward. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States, with the tacit approvel of Congress ordered American troops into action in Korea prior to any decision by the U. N. to intervene. The fact is not that the United Nations dragged the United States into Korea, but that we brought the United Nations into the action in Korea.

The second misconception about the Korean action is that the United States was operating under the guidance and direction of Soviet officials in the United Nations. The charge is sometimes made that an assistant secretary general of the United Nations was a Russian and in that position it is claimed that he knew of every troop movement in Korea.

The fact is, of course, that the commanding general of United Nations forces in Korea was Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He reported to the United Nations but did not take orders on such matters as the movement of troops or their placement. The United Nations learned about MacArthur's military actions after the fact, not before. It is true, of course, that the U. N. advised against an attack across the Yalu River on the grounds that it would bring Communist China into the conflict. And interestingly enough it was only when MacArthur ignored this advice and his forces approached the Yalu River, that the Chinese Communists did enter the war. But let me answer here and now to any implication that the Russian Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations was privy to military secrets of the MacArthur command. He was not.

One final comment about Korea. It has been repeated over and over again that the United States provided more than 90 percent of the casualties. That is true. But let me remind you that this 90 percent figure does not take into account the casualties of the South Koreans which more than equalled the casualties of American soldiers. Furthermore, it ignores the fact that the United States would surely have fought alone in Korea had it not been for the U. N. Ambassador Lodge, chief of the United States Mission to the United Nations, has remarked that if it had not been for the help we received in Korea, the United States would have found it necessary to put two more divisions of its own in the field. While American casualties were high, they would have been much higher without U. N. help. Let's never forget that fact.

IS THE U. N. DOMINATED BY THE SOVIET?

A second misconception about the United Nations, which is promoted by those who attack it, is that the organization is dominated by the Soviet Union. The fact is, however, that the United States has never lost an important vote in the General Assembly, and the Soviet Union has never won an important vote. Time after time after time when the votes have been tallied, it is the Soviet Union that is on the short end of the vote. If anyone should be discouraged about participation in the United Nations, it should be the Soviet Union. It is the Communists who have been overwhelmed by votes in the General Assembly and who have had their motives exposed in debate.

COMMUNIST EMPLOYEES

A third fallacy promoted by U. N. opponents is that the Secretariat is riddled with Communist employees, many of whom are disloyal Americans. The fact is that more than one-half of the employees in the International Secretariat are Americans, and I for one do not operate on the theory that most Americans are disloyal.

The facts are that several years ago 17 Americans employed by the United Nations refused to answer McCarthy-type questions put to them by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. In line with the thinking of those days, the American public was led to believe that each and every one of those Americans was a Communist. The Secretary General of the United Nations forthwith fired these American employees despite the fact that their only alleged wrong-doing consisted of invoking the guaranty of the United States Constitution against self-incrimination.

At the present time all Americans employed by the United Nations are subject to a security check devised by the Department of Justice and if any of the American employees

of the United Nations are Communists it is unknown to the FBI. Nevertheless, those who seek to destroy public confidence in the United Nations convey the impression that the U. N. continues today to employ Communists of American nationality.

U. N. A WORLD GOVERNMENT

A further misconception promoted by enemies of the United Nations is that it is a world government. They allege that since the charter is a treaty and hence the supreme law of the land it operates in derogation of the United States Constitution. They conveniently overlook the decision of the supreme court of California in the Sei-Fuji case which expressly denied that certain provisions of the charter are self-executing in character. They seek to create the impression that such conventions as the Genocide Convention (which has been pigeonholed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) and the Human Rights Convention (which has not even been signed) have somehow become the law of the land. They conveniently ignore the fact that the General Assembly can only pass recommendatory resolutions, that the United States can veto any substantive proposal in the Security Council and that no treaty can bind the United States unless approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

THE COST OF THE U. N. AND ITS PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

Another misconception encouraged by anti-U. N. forces is that it is an expensive venture for the United States. The fact is that the United Nations costs the United States $13 million a year. In addition we contribute about $12 million a year to specialized agencies of the United Nations. This means that the organization costs American citizens 16 cents each per year. The price of two quarts of gasoline.

Another impression promoted by those who seek to destroy the U. N. is that the vast majority of the American people are opposed to it. But again, what are the facts? A recent study of the University of Michigan indicates that only 5 percent of American adults want the United States to pull out of the United Nations, whereas some 80 percent believe that the U. N. and our participation in it is good for America.

I have also detected on the part of some critics of the United Nations the promotion of the idea that the United Nations is an institution conceived and promoted primarily by the Democrats. I do not want to inject any political overtones into these remarks, but I desire to call your attention to the fact that no Democrat has ever served as chief of the United States Mission to the United Nations. When President Truman appointed a representative to the United Nations, he selected Senator Warren Austin, a stanch Republican from Vermont. When Senator Austin resigned, his place was taken by former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., a Republican from Massachusetts. Moreover, I hardly need remind this audience that probably the three most influential members of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference were members of the Republican Party—Senator Vandenberg, Mr. Dulles and Mr. Stassen.

The fact is that the cause of the United Nations has always had wide support from Republicans and Democrats alike and that support is likely to continue. The reason the United Nations has had wide support in both of our political parties is that most Americans are rational and objective in their analysis of what the U. N. is and what it may become. They are realistic in accepting the problems and responsibilities of the United States in the world today. They are not frustrated at the state of the world in which we live.

If we are to be rational in determining whether American participation in the United Nations is good for us or bad for us we must not base our analysis upon emotion and frustration. Instead, we must look at the U. N. to see what it has done and what it can do.

THE U. N. AND COLONIALISM

One of the great accomplishments of the United Nations in the past decade which is often overlooked is the tremendous impetus which it has given to the creation of new free states. Indonesia and Israel are two good examples. Neither of these states would be independent today were it not for the United Nations. Libya also owes its independence to the United Nations. Many other states such as India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Cambodia and others probably would not be free today had it not been for the impetus given self-government by the very existence of the United Nations.

SETTLING DISPUTES

It is hard to be objective in listing the disputes which the United Nations has settled because of the difficulty of analyzing the specific reasons why disputes are settled. We do know, however, that the United Nations was instrumental in getting Russian troops out of Iran, in keeping the Kashmir dispute from being settled by force, in bringing about an armistice between Israel and the Arab states, and in the support of Greece against Communist attack.

One trouble in getting popular understanding of U. N. successes in settling disputes is that peaceful settlements don't make headlines. It is the wars and crises that capture the news.

THE U. N. AND ECONOMICS

But aside from the political operations of the United Nations, it has also been instrumental in relieving starvation among the children of the world through the Children's Fund and in improving the health of millions of people through the operations of the World Health Organization.

One of the strongest anti-Communist instruments in the world today is the technical assistance program carried on under United Nations auspices. This program gives assistance to underdeveloped countries to enable them to improve living conditions. Experience has shown us that communism gets its best foothold in countries where living conditions can be exploited for political purposes. Thus, every contribution the United Nations makes to the improvement of living standards serves to create conditions which are the antithesis of those which nourish communism.

I could continue in this vein to describe some of the accomplishments of the United Nations. But I think I have said enough to make the point that if we are to assess the organization in terms of whether our participation promotes the national interest we must look to its positive aspects as well as to its negative aspects.

When one considers the fact that for 10 years the world has suffered from a bitter cold war, it is surprising to me—indeed it is remarkable—that the United Nations has worked as well as it has. The Charter has been an adaptable instrument to serve so well in the changing world situation.

When the Soviet veto stymied the development of the Security Council as an effective deterrent to aggression, the General Assembly was able to function in helping organize international force for use in Korea. The Assembly has now in being a Collective Measures Committee that has worked out an elaborate set of proposals that could be put into effect should there be another Korean-type attack on a free nation.

Furthermore, the Charter by authorizing the creation of regional defense arrangements inside the charter but outside the veto, has made it possible to set up a series of regional defense arrangements such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These organizations have in a sense filled the vacuum resulting from the ineffectiveness of the Security Council in organizing international defense forces.

In addition to being an organization adaptable to changing world conditions the United Nations has provided a forum for almost daily contact between high-ranking officials from all over the world. When one considers that no President of the United States has talked with the head of the Soviet state since 1945, it is easy to see how important it is to maintain the contacts we have at the United Nations. It is certain that if the world is ever to live at peace that peace must rest either on a mutuality of tolerance or upon force. The United Nations gives us an opportunity to try settling by peaceful means the fundamental ideological conflict that splits the world.

In concluding my remarks, I suggest to those gathered here that you do your utmost to inject an element of realism in our attitudes toward foreign policy in general and the United Nations in particular.

There are only three possible courses of action open to us in this world. We could proceed on the theory that the only way of assuring peace and freedom would be for this Nation to dominate the world. That course is unthinkable. It embraces the doctrine of preventive war and would destroy the very peace and freedom essential to the continued development of this Nation.

A second course would be for us systematically to try to isolate ourselves from the rest of the world on the theory that we could build America into an impenetrable fortress. I know of no reputable military authority, scientist, economist, or responsible Government official who thinks this course is possible.

Finally, we can by persuasion, example, and the logic and strength of our democratic Government, encourage the development by peaceful means of the kind of world in which man's freedom can grow. This course of action involves our full-hearted participation in the United Nations. It means that we must work with as many nations as possible, and not against them.

I am opposed to any breaking off contact with the Communist or neutralist nations of this world. I am convinced that our form of government, our form of society, is in a sense the wave of the future. The more we have to do with other peoples, the more we have to do with other nations, the greater the likelihood that the march of man toward individual freedom will become worldwide. The superiority of economic and political freedom of choice for the individual constitute our greatest defense weapon against communism at home and abroad. No ideology of totalitarianism can win the minds of men and women abroad where the fight for freedom must be won in the century ahead if we in the United States through the United Nations give support to the ideal of a system of international justice through law. Disappointments will be many, and progress may be slow but the hope for peace offers no other alternative. Let us hope that the American people will close ranks and face these new problems of foreign policy with a united front.

HELLS CANYON DAM VERSUS IDAHO POWER CO. DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Idaho Farm Journal published a very interesting editorial by the editor, Ed Emerine on the subject "What's the Difference Between 6.69 and 2.8 Mills." In his comments on power costs in the Pacific Northwest, the editor points out—and I shall read only a sentence or two before

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks—that:

We have yet to have any of those who advocate Idaho Power Co.'s dam, or dams, for Hells Canyon, come out in the open and discuss the costs as disclosed in Examiner Costello's recommendation to the Federal Power Commission.

The editor goes on to say:

Here is the examiner's analysis of power output and costs:

Three-dam plan: Total prime power, 505,000 kilowatts; power cost per kilowatt-hour, 6.69 mills. Total annual cost, $27,921,000.

High Hells Canyon Dam: Total prime power, 924,000 kilowatts; power cost per kilowatt-hour, 2.8 mills. Total annual cost, $28,567,000.

All of those who are seeking industry for Idaho and eastern Oregon had better take another look at the above figures. How will Idaho Power Co. attract industry from the Bonneville power area, which charges around 2 mills, when ITC would have to charge 6.69 mills. And what farmer, householder, or businessman wants to pay more than double just to have Idaho Power Co.?

That is a pertinent question, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks bearing upon the issue of the Hells Canyon Dam.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY THE EDITOR

(By Ed Emerine)

What's the difference between 6.69 and 2.8 mills? We have yet to have any of those who advocate Idaho Power Co.'s dam, or dams, for Hells Canyon, come out in the open and discuss the costs as disclosed in Examiner Costello's recommendations to the Federal Power Commission.

Here is the examiner's analysis of power output and costs:

Three-dam plan: Total prime power, 505,000 kilowatts; power cost per kilowatt-hour, 6.69 mills. Total annual cost, $27,921,000.

High Hells Canyon Dam: Total prime power, 924,000 kilowatts; power cost per kilowatt-hour, 2.8 mills. Total annual cost, $28,567,000.

All of those who are seeking industry for Idaho and eastern Oregon had better take another look at the above figures. How will Idaho Power Co. attract industry from the Bonneville power area, which charges around 2 mills, when IPC would have to charge 6.69 mills? And what farmer, householder, or businessman wants to pay more than double just to have Idaho Power Co.?

It's something to think about. But we'll bet that if you take up these facts with the three-dam advocates, you won't get an answer. All they'll do is start charging that the Journal is socialistic and trying to federalize the Northwest. And they'll say the only way to stop this vicious trend is to get the 6.69 mills electricity instead of 2.8.

After all, when you run out of facts to support your argument, about the only thing left is to try to scare the people with wild tales of socialism and loud and vicious name-calling.

But sometimes just the whisper of truth reaches a longer way than all this three-dam bluster.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOOVER COMMISSION THREAT TO COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Hoover Commission is making so many assaults upon urgent and important functions of Government that it is hard to keep pace with these attacks. However, I should like to voice some brief comments on the latest Hoover Commission proposal for wrecking imperative Federal services. Many of my constituents join in these comments.

Mr. Hoover and his aides have recommended that user charges be levied on waterways improved with Government funds. This would apply to water commerce passing through locks such as those at Bonneville and McNary Dams on the Columbia River, and, I presume, to water navigation made possible by channel deepening on such river systems as the Missouri and the Willamette.

Superficially, Mr. President, I imagine that the Hoover suggestions make sense to a great many people. Why should not barges, tugs, stern-wheelers, and freighters pay to pass through Government locks on great inland water routes like the Columbia and Mississippi?

Yet, we must remember that, since the era of George Washington, the Government has dredged, deepened, and marked with buoys our interior waterways. These were the first great routes of empire. It was the Missouri and then the Columbia River system which took Lewis and Clark westbound across the continent with our flag, 150 years ago.

Free access through Government locks has provided a yardstick to help bring down freight tolls on the railroads and the big trucklines. Where there has been water competition in the Pacific Northwest, for example, the charges to our farmers for transporting wheat, orchard fruits, and general produce are far cheaper than in areas where no water navigation exists.

Think of what Government improvements have meant in my region. In 1933, before construction of Bonneville Dam by the Corps of Army Engineers, only 85,715 tons of cargo passed into the upper Columbia at Cascade Rapids. By 1953, two decades later, this had soared to 1,343,575 tons—an increase of a phenomenal 1,600 percent. What had made the difference? It was the high-lift locks installed in Bonneville Dam, where also vast quantities of low-cost hydroelectric power have been generated for the farms, homes, and factories of our region.

Now, the Hoover Commission would rule out such gains, by applying heavy water-user tolls to use of the Bonneville locks. This is done in the name of that old Hoover cliché that those who receive Government services should pay for them.

How plausible this sounds, Mr. President. How logical it seems, Mr. President.

But, Mr. President, who would dare apply this doctrine to our daily lives? Would we say that only the people with children in the school ages should pay school taxes? Would we apply the cruel and grim rule that a man with 6 children would pay 6 times as heavy a school tax as a father with 1 child? Would we exempt families with no children from all payment of school taxes?

What a mockery this would make of our educational system in America.

Suppose a man had a fire in his house. Would we bill him $250 the next afternoon for turning out the hook-and-ladder truck to quell the fire? Is that not what the Hoover theories mean? Those who receive Government services should pay for them. Why should a man whose house is not on fire pay taxes to douse the flames in the house of another man?

Move on to the realm of law enforcement. If a family requires the protection of several policemen because the family has been invaded by some lawless marauder, should we bill that family for the patrolmen's wages? What possible good could come to a civilized society from such a harsh and savage doctrine?

Yet, Mr. President, this is what might occur if we follow through on the Hoover doctrine that those who receive Government services should be the only people to pay for them.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD three informative articles on the newest recommendations of the Hoover Commission, by Alan S. Emory, who is the Washington correspondent of a fearless and enlightened daily newspaper in upstate New York, the Watertown Daily Times.

Mr. Emory's articles were published June 10, 11, and 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 10, 1955]

USER CHARGES URGED ON UNITED STATES-AIDED WATERWAYS—HOOVER'S AND EISENHOWER'S GROUPS ALSO TO ADVOCATE SHARING OF COSTS

(By Alan S. Emory)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—Both the Hoover Commission and the President's Special Committee on Water Resources will recommend user charges on federally aided waterways, it was learned today.

WOULD SHARE COSTS

The two reports will also advocate strongly the sharing of costs on water projects, with the formula depending on the community's ability to pay, the size of the community or State and the scope of the project.

Both features are expected to provide heated debate in the Halls of Congress.

The user charge proposal is an outgrowth of a plan to charge tolls on waterways built with Federal funds. This plan, originally part of the report by the President's Committee on Transportation, was stricken after its premature release aroused substantial opposition.

The first draft, favored strongly by Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, would have set the tolls sufficiently high to repay the Government for every penny it had ever invested in water projects. This was later modified.

Informed sources said the President wanted his Water Resources Committee report submitted before the Hoover Commission's so he would have a position from which to comment on proposals by the independent agency. This was the time for the transportation suggestions.

But controversy has postponed the President's committee project. At first it had been requested for use in the state of the Union address.

More recently it was presented to the President, but he reportedly rejected it as too vague in defining policy and demanded a more positive statement. Under Secretary

of the Interior Clarence A. Davis was supposed to brief the report before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress last week, but he confessed that the subject of his speech "is the occasion of some little embarrassment." The report wasn't ready, although it is due soon.

The subject matter of the Hoover Commission's task force report on water resources—although part of the power section has leaked out—is so closely guarded that members slated to address the American Society of Civil Engineers in St. Louis June 15 do not yet know what they can say.

W. W. Horner, St. Louis consulting engineer and chairman of the flood-control task subgroup, feels that as of now he cannot say anything.

The Commission has set Saturday for a meeting, at which time the St. Louis speeches may be cleared.

Because of the complex and controversial nature of the water resources report—release of which has been demanded in Congress—Chairman Herbert Hoover has not selected the three Commissioners to draw up the unit's final water resources report.

* * * * *

The President's Cabinet Committee and Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the water resources task force of the Hoover Commission, have been in contact several times, and there have been conferences between the two staffs.

A pattern of policy will be set by the two reports and by the water resources regulations laid down by the Bureau of the Budget.

The main theme will be to get the Federal Government out of the water business—power, navigation, flood control, and reclamation—except in rare instances.

In this respect the Army engineers have split with the top echelon in the Pentagon. The split went so far that when the President's Committee—including the Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Interior, and Agriculture, plus, on occasion, representatives from the Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments, and the Federal Power Commission—never called in the Engineers for consultation.

Beyond the waterway-user charges and cost-sharing plans, both the President's Committee and the Hoover Commission report will go into:

1. Where to draw the line on activities of the Federal Government on water projects. For example, Amarillo, Tex., wants the United States to provide it with a community water supply. The reports will call for much more State and local activity than now exists.

2. What projects are economically feasible. Staff studies claim there are now too many ratholes caused by eager grasping for big projects.

The Hoover Commission has turned up evidence of one city that demanded—and got—a waterway just to drive down rail rates, a subject that normally would be handled by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Congressional pressure is a distinct advantage in getting Federal waterways built, the Commission found, though many do not pay off in benefits to the country as a whole.

One statement that may yet prove to be the most explosive of the whole task-force project may be the one by Charles D. Curran, staff director, before the rivers and harbors congress:

"The job the task force was called upon to do," he said, "was one of finding the weaknesses and faults in the Federal water resources and power-development activities. It was not called upon to find out and report on the good features of the program."

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 11, 1955]

UNITED STATES MISUSES WATER RESOURCES, IS CLAIM—HOOVER COMMISSION DRAFTS RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH MAY NOT BE APPROVED

(By Alan S. Emory)

WASHINGTON, June 10.—The Hoover Commission water resources task force, whose report is considered the hottest on the books, sums up its philosophy this way:

"The Federal Government has used water resources and power development projects, which should be undertaken exclusively for economic purposes, to accomplish indirect social and political ends."

Its controversial recommendations, not expected to be released to the public until next month, undoubtedly will be watered down by the Commission in its report. Much of the same thinking and policy will be reflected in the report of the President's Cabinet Committee on Water Resources.

Among the task force recommendations are these:

Eventual sale or disposal of Government hydroelectric power projects to States, localities or private enterprise. This presumably would strike at the heart of the Tennessee Valley Authority operation, although former TVA Administrator David E. Lilienthal said in a recent speech that the long-run benefits of TVA might turn out to result from waterway improvements, rather than low-cost power.

Relating power rates on Federal projects to the cost of production, with rates generally not falling below those set by private industry.

Payment by recipients of irrigation and flood control benefits of 50 percent or more of the benefit value.

Benefits from one phase of a project, like power, should not be used to pay for other phases, like irrigation and flood control.

Federal responsibility should be limited to national defense, regulation of interstate commerce, and preservation of the national domain."

In exceptional cases loans should be made on projects where revenues would assure repayment in a period not to exceed 50 years.

The United States should not assume responsibility for a project that can be discharged by a State or local government or private enterprise, except where the national interest might be affected.

All flood control work now being done by the soil conservation service of the Agriculture Department should be transferred to the Army engineers.

The present Interagency Water Resources Committee and the water resources section of the Bureau of the Budget should be reconstituted a Water Resources Board and Board of Review respectively. These two agencies would have to pass on all water improvements, making recommendations to Congress only if the project met tight standards. They would make periodic reports to the President and to Congress and would undertake regular reviews of all backlogs of authorized works.

The task force, headed by Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the board of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., said current policy "fosters competition among its agencies, causes controversy, confusion, duplication, and waste, encourages, rather than curbs, bureaucratics ambitions."

* * * * *

One observer said that the Hoover Commission task force, while opposed to Government power projects as a matter of philosophy, was surprised to find those now in existence has proved so feasible economically.

Both the commission and the task force are headed by men who believe strongly in a minimum amound of government competition with private business. Staff members of both units say that they are run with an iron hand. In describing Admiral Moreell's operation, one worker said, "He got red and rumbled once and everybody ran for cover."

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 12, 1955]

GROUP TO BLAST POWER PROJECTS—HOOVER COMMISSION TO COME OUT WITH ATTACK ON PRESENT, PAST, AND FUTURE PLANS—MOREELL OPPOSES GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH BUSINESS—CRITICS HAVE CHARGED THAT TASK FORCE IS STACKED WITH 26 PRIVATE-POWER ADVOCATES

(By Alan S. Emory)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The Hoover Commission, which meets today on its water resources report, is expected to come out with a blast against Federal power projects, present, past, and future.

NOT A SURPRISE

This will not surprise critics of the task force, who have argued bitterly that the task force, under Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the board of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., was stacked with 26 private-power advocates.

Admiral Moreell favors getting the Government out of competition with private business. The man on the task force he listens to most closely is J. W. Reavis, a Jones & Laughlin director and director of the National City Bank, of Cleveland, the Industrial Rayon Corp., the Hershaw Chemical Co., the Electric Controller & Manufacturing Co., four other firms and the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce.

Of 10 engineers on the task force, 9 were on the action panel of the Engineers Joint Council. In 1951 this panel, headed by W. W. Horner, of St. Louis, chairman of the flood control sub-group of the task force, advocated:

1. "Sale of Federal power * * * in general * * * at the generating stations."

2. Federal, State, and local taxation of Federal-power projects.

3. "The Federal Government should not engage in the production or supply of power primarily in order to fill the power requirements of any community or region"—a crack at the Tennessee Valley Authority.

4. Except where Congress specifically reserves authority, local enterprise should not only be encouraged, but should have priority to make hydroelectric power development under proper governmental control and regulation.

5. The law should provide that States or other local agencies may acquire hydroelectric power developments or transmission lines constructed by the United States.

6. Federal hydroelectric projects cannot reasonably be used as measures of economic efficiency or of propriety of costs or rates for privately produced power.

The nine members of the council on the Task Force are Arthur B. Roberts, chairman of the waterpower subgroup; William D. Shannon, another member of the subgroup; Carey H. Brown, Julian Hinds, Mr. Horner, Frank H. Newmam, Jr., Malcolm Pirnie, Royce J. Tipton, and Lacey V. Murrow.

Mr. Roberts favors private companies' taking over control of all Government power projects and made a report along this line for Haskins and Sells, auditors for a number of private firms including Electric Bond & Share. The report also favored bus-bar sales. The Roberts report prepared in addition for the old Hoover Commission in 1949 was criticized by four old commission members, including Sen. GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, Vermont, as special pleading for the line taken by private utility companies.

Mr. Shannon is author of a letter to a Seattle newspaper in which he criticized public-power theories as socialistic.

Chairman of the reclamation and water-supply sub-group is former Wyoming Gov. L. A. Miller. He wrote a Saturday Evening Post article on power in 1949 called The Battle That Squandered Billions. It was reprinted by the Edison Electric Institute and many private companies.

Also on this panel is Harry E. Polk, former president of the National Reclamation Association, which said in 1952 that "sales of power from Federal developments should be made to public and private users at the bus bar where possible." In opposing the Federal Government plan for a high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River in Idaho, Mr. Polk said big industry in the Pacific Northwest may have been seduced with the bait of cheap power with the deliberate intent of overloading the capacity of existing installations so that Congress would appropriate more money to build more power dams.

R. W. Sawyer, another member of the power sub-group, is a former reclamation association chief and held the same post with the Oregon Reclamation Congress, which was financially backed by private utility firms.

William B. Bates, of the flood-control panel is a director of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, which strongly opposed the renomination of Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Olds is a strong public power man. In September, 1953, the chamber favored "sale to private owners of all Government-owned property not necessary for the legitimate functions of Government."

E. A. Kracke, accounting adviser to the task force, is a partner of Haskins & Sells. Carl Byoir, press relations counsel, has clients that have strongly opposed TVA. Harry W. Morrison of the flood control unit is head of Morrison-Knudsen, large contracting firm that has contracts with the Idaho Power Co., a bidder to construct dams in opposition to Hells Canyon.

When the Hoover Commission published a press release on the task force it omitted some details about the members.

The biographies did not say that:

Mr. Horner, as St. Louis city engineer, was for a while Admiral Moreell's employer.

Mr. Reavis was a Jones & Laughlin director.

James P. Growdon of the navigation subgroup is an engineering consultant to several utility companies.

Albert C. Mattei of the power subgroup is one of Chairman Hoover's closest associates.

Mr. Morrison is a friend of Interior Secretary Douglas McKay and a former employer of Ralph Tudor, who just quit as interior undersecretary.

Mr. Pirnie is a trustee of the Committee on Economical Development.

Nowhere does the press release show that any of the task force members, with the exception of Mr. Brown, was on the Engineers Joint Council.

Other outspoken Commission foes of public power include Utah's Gov. J. Bracken Lee, John Jirgal, Chicago utility finance specialist; Donald Richberg, general counsel to the task force and former New Deal braintruster, and Charles L. Andrews of the power subgroup, a Memphis cotton shipper who says he does not support TVA.

While a few task force members are not outright foes of public power, there is not a public power advocate in the 26. For this reason, the task force report, which advocates Federal disposal of all TVA properties and private enterprise construction of all atomic energy electric power plants, will not be a surprise—although it will cause lots of heated debate.

DISCUSSION AT THE FORTHCOMING GENEVA CONFERENCE OF THE STATUS OF NATIONS UNDER COMMUNIST CONTROL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has the morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 116) favoring discussion at the coming Geneva Conference of the status of nations under Communist control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me for a very few minutes, I should like to make a brief statement concerning the resolution.

Each Senator has on his desk a printed copy of the hearings on Senate Resolution 116. He also has a copy of the resolution and of the very excellent report on the resolution by 14 members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, all except one having been present at the time the resolution was considered in committee.

Mr. President, it is somewhat unusual to have a resolution submitted in the Senate late on Monday, to have a committee hold hearings and consider it almost into the evening of Tuesday, and to have the Senate debate it on Wednesday. But many unusual factors surround the resolution. First, it is somewhat unusual to ask unanimous consent to consider a foreign policy resolution between quorum calls in the Senate without advance notice to the Members. Second, it is very unusual to have any such resolution considered by the Senate without first having obtained recommendations from the Senate's agent—the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I hope I state the sentiment of the membership when I say that no committee of the Senate is composed of men of greater stature, greater intelligence, greater devotion to duty, or greater patriotism than the distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on both sides of the aisle, who are presided over by the dean of the Senate, the very able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Like all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who voted last evening, I am opposed to the resolution. I am opposed to it not because I am unconcerned with the enslavement of free people who have been brought behind the Iron Curtain; but because, in my opinion, if the Senate does not fearlessly stand up and reject the resolution overwhelmingly, the Senate will no longer be a partner with the Executive in the conduct of foreign relations. It will become the dominant force.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not at this point. I shall conclude my statement, and the junior Senator from Wisconsin then will have ample opportunity to present his views.

I ask the Senate not to be diverted from the primary issue involved: Shall the Senate in this critical hour—as our leader goes forward to represent the Nation in a conference with other great nations of the world—instruct, advise, and place that leader in a straitjacket? I have no doubt that attempts will be made to divert the Senate from that main issue. But I hope the Senate will refuse to be diverted.

For that reason, when the junior Senator from Wisconsin on Monday afternoon asked the Senate for permission to submit, out of order, the resolution, and when the junior Senator from Wisconsin on Monday afternoon asked the Senate to proceed immediately to consider the resolution, the majority leader was forced to object. I did not object to the sentiment, affection, and concern for enslaved peoples, which the resolution implied. I think every Member of the Senate, on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle, has made a record well known to this body and to the country as to his feelings in this matter.

But I felt it was my duty, as the designated representative of the majority party, and the one who must be responsible for maintaining the dignity, the traditions, and the procedures of the Senate, to stand up and to counsel the Senators present not to take any action on a resolution of this character or any amendment to it unless an opportunity were first given our experts in that field, the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to digest the proposal; to evaluate it; to call in the experts from the Department of State; to counsel with the constitutional authority, the President; and then to make their recommendations.

I conferred with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He agreed to join with me in asking the Committee on Foreign Relations to take prompt action, because the junior Senator from Wisconsin had stated that he felt he should have action by Thursday; that he felt if the resolution were referred to the committee, prompt action could not be obtained; that he had previously sent a similar resolution to the committee, which the committee had not approved.

At that time I made a statement, and I should like to have every Member of the Senate follow it carefully, because more is involved in this matter than a desire on the part of the Senate to express its concern for the peoples of the nations who have been brought into the Communist

orbit. In the question before the Senate there are involved the demand made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin and the assurances given by the majority leader of the Senate. I have spoken about the request of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I said that he asked, first, for permission to submit the resolution, and second, for its immediate consideration.

I see present in the Chamber the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and perhaps one or two Senators on this side of the aisle who were present on Monday evening. There were also present perhaps half a dozen Senators on the other side of the aisle.

The acting minority leader, the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] supported the position of the majority leader, which was that Senators must feel free to leave the Chamber to go to their committees, to their States, or to their homes, fully assured that the word of the leadership is a bond, and that there will be no dilly-dallying, shinnying, or weaseling out of responsibilities.

So I pleaded with the junior Senator from Wisconsin, to permit the resolution to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that the recommendations of the committee could be obtained—not because I wanted to bury the resolution; not because I wanted to sweep it under the rug; not because the majority leader wanted to bottle it up; but because it was sound, orderly procedure.

I said on that occasion that we must never adopt a procedure in the Senate—because the Senate operates, so to speak, in a goldfish bowl—whereby action is taken on foreign policy between quorum calls, after sundown, and without advance notice.

I shall now quote from page 8722 of the RECORD of Monday, June 20, 1955. I had just finished saying that I hoped the resolution could be referred to the committee, thus following the regular procedure. The junior Senator from Wisconsin then asked:

How soon will that be?

I then said:

I have attempted to assure my friend from Wisconsin that if he will give me an opportunity to make a study of the resolution—*I have been a busy man most of today*—

Senators will remember that on Monday the military defense appropriation bill, with the Marine Corps amendment, was under consideration—

I shall try to study it tonight.

I think that was almost 7 o'clock.

I shall confer with the appropriate Members in the morning, and I shall be glad to discuss it with the Senator further.

I ask my colleagues to listen and to follow me carefully in this recital of events. I want every Member, on both sides of the aisle, to hear this statement, and to put himself in the position of the junior Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Texas, because, except for the grace of God, it might have been he.

The question before the Senate today has greater implications than merely the consideration of a resolution. The junior Senator from Wisconsin was asking on Monday evening for the consideration by the Senate of a resolution. The majority leader has responsibilities. I will say that the Senator from Wisconsin did not ask that the Senate vote on the resolution on Monday evening. He asked to submit it on Monday evening, and he would have followed that with a request for its immediate consideration, so that a vote could be had on the following day or at some other appropriate time.

I have no desire to mislead the Senate, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin. But I will repeat what I said to the Senate when the Senator sought to submit the resolution late in the evening, long after the morning hour had passed. He wanted consideration of the resolution so the Senate could act on it without its going to the committee, and he said he did not want it buried in committee. He did not use that language, but he pointed out that he had other resolutions in the committee which had never seen the light of day. I knew what the Senator was talking about.

I had no desire whatever, nor do I have any desire now, as I made it clear to the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, and as I make it clear to the Senate now, to prevent the Members of this body from expressing themselves in the strongest language they care to use, and by a yea-and-nay vote. I said to the Senate:

I have no desire to keep any Senator from expressing any view he may possess or to keep his view from being recorded. But the resolution would have a better chance of appealing to the intelligence of the Members of this body if it followed the orderly procedure.

I want to repeat that:

I have no desire to keep any Senator from expressing any view he may possess or to keep his view from being recorded.

On the basis of that and other statements, and the assurances of the acting minority and the majority leaders, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin permitted the resolution to go to the committee.

In keeping with the letter of my statement and in keeping with the spirit of my statement, after full consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations at his hospital room yesterday morning, and with his knowledge and with his approval, I asked the committee to give every Senator the right to express his views and to be recorded. It has been said—and I do not want it truthfully to be said of the Senator from Texas—that Senators can maneuver and Senators can be clever and Senators can move that resolutions be referred to committees for the purpose of burial. That has never been my purpose and it was not my purpose in this specific instance.

When I make a statement to this body that I have no desire to prevent any Senator from expressing himself or being recorded, I mean just that. I hope the Senate will not be diverted, by any parliamentary tactic, from putting itself in position where it can say "Yes" or "No" to this resolution, just as the Foreign Relations Committee did yesterday.

I might say that a substantial number of the members of my party, and some members of the other party, have discussed with me the desirability of having an expression of the sense of the Senate, not as to the agenda of the Geneva Conference, not as to what the President should or can or must do, but of the concern of the Senate over the fate and the future of people who have been enslaved.

For myself, I shall be glad to join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the minority policy committee, members of the Foreign Relations Committee, or any other Members of the Senate, in the submission of a Senate resolution. I shall be glad to have it referred to the appropriate committee, where it can be considered thoroughly—dotting all the i's and crossing all the t's, in consultation with all the career officers who serve the country in the State Department, the Secretary of State and the President. I shall be glad to cooperate in bringing something to this floor that will be interpreted not as a gun at anyone's head, but as an expression of genuine sentiment.

In my opinion, the issue before the Senate is a very simple one. It is whether the President of the United States shall be sent to the Big Four Conference in a straitjacket. I should like to point out that this issue is not confined merely to the present President. I recall, with some distress, and with some depression, that just before a certain spokesman for this Nation went away on one occasion to attend an important conference, some rather critical speeches were made about him.

I point out to the Senate that the President is not a member of my party. The Secretary of State is not a member of my party. On the occasion to which I have just referred the Secretary of State was a member of my party. I felt it was cruel to send that spokesman forward to speak for the greatest Nation in the world, when derogatory things were being said about him at home. But although the President is not a member of my party, he is the President of my country—the only President we have. I think we should stop, look, and listen before we leave any shadow of a doubt about how the Senate feels on the particular issue now before us.

There were some Senators who said, "If the resolution is tabled, or if it is voted down, such action will be interpreted by the Communists as throwing overboard all the peoples whom the Communists have engulfed. It will also be misunderstood by some of the minority groups in this country."

Mr. President, the position of the United States Senate must never be judged on the basis of what Communist propaganda may or may not say. The position of the Senate must be based on whether we are right or whether we are wrong, and, Mr. President, it is wrong to adopt a resolution such as that now before the Senate.

In our dealings with other nations, Members on both sides of the aisle must remember that only one man can speak for our country. Mr. President, he can-

not speak very clearly, and he cannot speak very effectively, if he has a congressional gag in his mouth before he speaks.

Stripped of all its verbiage and all its gimmicks, the adoption of the resolution would put the President in a straitjacket.

If the Senate wants to express itself, and if the Senate has any confidence in itself and in its committees—and the Foreign Relations Committee, as I have said, is a very able committee, one which is manned with a staff that is second to none—members can sit in consultation with the President and the Secretary of State, and draw upon the wealth of experience and the wisdom of some of the senior members of the committee, and with such support, a resolution can be adopted which will express the sense of the Senate. Only last week, the Senator from Alabama, in whom I have the greatest confidence, and for whom I have the greatest respect, asked the majority leader to permit him to call up for immediate consideration a resolution involving the distinguished Helen Keller, and expressing the good wishes of the Senate. I said, "That resolution can stand the scrutiny of tolerant and able men. Submit the resolution this afternoon. Send it to the committee tonight. You can get it back the day after tomorrow. The Senate operates efficiently and expeditiously; and you can have a hearing, if necessary; and you can have a committee report on the resolution." That procedure was followed.

But, Mr. President, is a different procedure to be followed when we deal with the foreign policy of our Nation? If the Senate is in favor of dealing with foreign policy without following the recommendations of its Foreign Relations Committee, what is to keep the House of Representatives and its 435 Members from doing likewise?

Mr. President, I hope no Member of this body will be diverted. I hope all Members of this body will understand the basic issue in the resolution as I understand it, namely—Shall the Senate, on the eve of the Big Four conference, express the sense of the Senate in such a way as, in effect, to dictate and direct and circumscribe the activities of our negotiators?

I wish to make it abundantly clear that if the Senate desires to go on record regarding the fate and future of the nations which have been taken behind the Iron Curtain, at an appropriate time, in an appropriate manner, and after an appropriate committee has considered such a resolution, I shall be glad to see that the Senate has an opportunity to record its position.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] asked the majority leader to have the committee consider the resolution, and he said he wanted the Senate to consider it. The majority leader assured him that he had no desire to prevent any Senator from expressing himself or recording himself.

I hope every Member of the Senate will help me make good that assurance. As I assured some Senators this morning, I now assure all Senators there has been no dilatory move on the part of the majority leader, nor was there any on the past Monday. If we can vote this resolution either up or down, rid our calendar of it, meet it as fearless men in a free country trying to preserve liberty, then, Mr. President, in the quietness of our committee room, with the counsel of our most experienced members, acting with the advice of our most trusted public servants, we can draft any statement which a majority of that great committee deems desirable.

I wish to appeal to the membership to support me in seeing to it that every Senator has an opportunity fully to express himself, and in seeing to it that every Member has a full opportunity to be recorded on the pending resolution. If Senators do that, Mr. President, I assure them that I will treat each Member just as I treated the junior Senator from Wisconsin. He demanded prompt action on his resolution in the committee, and he got it. He wanted prompt action taken on the floor of the Senate and he shall get it. Perhaps the earliest opportunity for taking such action was on yesterday; and I want him to get it no later than today.

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Texas will permit me to make a statement at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had not intended to make a statement to the Senate at this point in the debate; but, rather, I had planned to wait until after the opening statement by the distinguished acting chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], had been made. However, in view of the statement which has been made by the distinguished majority leader, I think I should make a statement at this time.

Up to a certain point, Mr. President, as regards the procedural situation confronting the Senate, I fully agree with the majority leader. In the field of legislation, except under most unusual circumstances, I think that any exceptions to the regular procedure should be very rare, indeed.

It seems to me that when a resolution or proposed legislation affecting the foreign policy of our Government or, indeed, affecting domestic policy, or even a proposal expressing the sense of the Senate on a particular question, is presented, the proper legislative procedure is for such a resolution or bill or other legislative proposal to be referred to the appropriate committee. On that point, the majority leader was sound; and in my earlier discussion with him, I agreed that that was the proper procedure, and I was prepared to support him fully regarding it.

I have very carefully read and reread the RECORD. I realize that there is always room for an honest difference of opinion. In this great deliberative body, we must recognize the fact that Members who have sincere convictions on a given subject may place somewhat different interpretations upon the facts.

I think that assurance was given to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] that if he would not press for the taking of the action he requested—and for which, in fact, he could not press, because it was subject to objection; and I say quite frankly that if the majority leader had not been in his seat at the moment, but if the minority leader had been here, instead, I would have objected, even though the request had come from my side of the aisle—that if he would not press his request for the taking of immediate action on the resolution, without having it referred to the appropriate committee, then, if it was possible to work out the parliamentary difficulty which arose late in the afternoon, very prompt consideration would be recommended by the majority leader to the Foreign Relations Committee. In that recommendation he had the full concurrence of the minority leader.

Of course, what the committee did was a matter subject entirely to the determination of the Foreign Relations Committee itself. I do not believe there was any statement or any implication as to what the action of the committee would be.

Apparently the distinguished majority leader—and I can quite understand his position—felt that he had made a further commitment—perhaps an implied one, if not a direct one—that not only would action be taken by the committee, but that insofar as his recommendation could be followed, the resolution would be brought before the Senate itself, for a direct vote by the Senate.

On that point I do not differ with the distinguished majority leader, although I do not so interpret the language which appears in the RECORD; and neither do I so interpret the language when it is considered on the basis of the customary procedure in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me at this point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How would the Senator from California interpret this language, if he received assurance from the Senator from Texas:

I have no desire to keep any Senator—

Not any member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but any Senator—

from expressing any view he may possess or from keeping his view from being recorded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Again, I do not wish to quarrel on the basis of a difference of opinion. The Senator from Texas made his statement. He may have had one thing in mind. I may have misinterpreted his position. In this great forum, in which we all pride ourselves on freedom of debate, it has been customary not to attempt to foreclose a Senator from expressing his views on any subject. Only after the most prolonged discussion have some of us who have had grave doubt as to the advisability of further discussion after a subject matter

has been thoroughly covered been willing to suggest parliamentary means of bringing debate to an end. Why? Because we feel that it is important that there be opportunity to discuss freely and amply any subject.

I interpret the remarks of the distinguished majority leader—and I think they are subject to such interpretation—to mean that he had no intention of foreclosing the Senator from Wisconsin from submitting his resolution, from discussing it on that day, if he desired to do so, or at any other time, on the floor of the Senate.

When the Senator from Wisconsin indicated that in the past he had submitted resolutions upon which, when referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, there had been no hearings, the Senator from Texas was giving his assurance, insofar as he could give assurance, to the Senator from Wisconsin that he would recommend to the committee—and in that he was joined by the minority leader—that the committee afford a prompt hearing, because, as the Senator from Wisconsin pointed out, this is a subject with respect to which he, at least, felt that time was of the essence. The Foreign Ministers were meeting in San Francisco at the very time, and if the normal committee processes had been followed—which would not have been unreasonable—and we had waited until next week, the issue would have been a moot question, so far as the Senator from Wisconsin was concerned.

So I feel that the distinguished majority leader was giving assurances that the Senator from Wisconsin would have an opportunity to present his views to the committee, that the committee would be able to hear him in public session, or in executive session, as the case might be; that the committee would be able to call representatives from the State Department, and then would make its decision.

Up to that point, I think the majority leader and the minority leader have no difference whatever. I do not wish to labor this point, because it is water over the dam. Personally I believe that it would have been better procedure, after listening to the testimony and the very cogent reasons which were presented—and I think they were cogent reasons—why it was not in the best interests of our foreign policy to have such a resolution adopted at this time, to follow the normal committee procedure.

Of course, we all recognize that we have a deep interest in the captive peoples behind the iron curtain. Nevertheless, personally I believe that it would have been better procedure for the committee to do what committees normally do, that is, to take action; and if it did not believe the resolution should be adopted, a motion could be made to table it. I was prepared to support, and did support, a motion to table the resolution in the committee.

I think that would have been effective action. The Senator from Wisconsin would have had his day in court. The committee itself, which is primarily charged with foreign policy, would have acted. The Senator from Wisconsin would still not have been foreclosed. If he had desired to pursue the matter, he could have moved to discharge the committee. But at least the question would have been handled in consonance with the customary and normal procedure of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me finish.

After all, we live by majority government. Sometimes our views prevail, and sometimes we are on the short side of a vote. One important feature of our great American constitutional system, which is unlike many other systems of the world, is that we are prepared to achieve the will of the majority in a parliamentary body, and support the decision with good grace. The decision of the committee has been made. It determined to report the resolution adversely. So discussion of the subject will be carried on by the acting chairman of the committee. I am prepared to support the decision of the Foreign Relations Committee in that regard, even though I feel that the other procedure would have been better.

I regret that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is not present in the Chamber. He told me that he was obliged to return to his office. He knew that I was about to discuss this subject, and the general procedures leading up to the present situation. I know that he has a very deep interest in this matter and a very deep conviction and concern with respect to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Indeed, I think all 96 Members of the United States Senate have a very deep concern about those who, through no fault of their own, find themselves enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known. I do not want, and I do not believe the Senate wants, either before the Iron Curtain or behind the Iron Curtain, to get the impression from Communist propaganda or otherwise, that the defeat of this resolution—if it is the judgment of the Senate, for the reasons presented, that it should be defeated—means any lack of interest in the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain. In my judgment that would not be the case. The record should be clear, and every Member of the Senate should clearly understand it.

I do not intend to take a great deal of the time of the Senate in placing material in the RECORD. I think the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] was in error when he felt that, merely because Pravda, as he pointed out in one of his speeches the other day, had indicated that the Soviet Union would not, at the meeting at the summit, discuss the question of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, that question could not be discussed at the summit. Certainly no Government of the United States—and certainly not the present Government—will permit the Soviet Union to say, by unilateral action, that a certain subject matter cannot be discussed, and that, ipso facto, it cannot be discussed. I think this was made very clear by Mr. Hoover, Acting Secretary of State, yesterday, when he said:

In the preliminary conversations that have already taken place regarding arrangements for the conference, it has been agreed that each of the participants would be free to take up any subject which it believed to be a contributory cause to world tensions.

Members of the Senate will find that statement on page 5 of the appendix, to the testimony in public session by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr.

I have been authorized by the President of the United States, after conferring with him this morning, to state that the question of the enslaved peoples in the satellite countries has been and now is of interest to him and to the executive branch of the Government, and has been the subject of numerous conferences.

He further authorizes me to state to the Senate that this question has also been the subject of a considerable number of conversations between the President of the United States and the minority leader, over a considerable period of months.

I submit that the record of President Eisenhower, who has been in office now for only a little more than 2 years, has consistently shown a deep interest in the subject matter, a deep interest in peace with honor, a deep interest in the subject of human freedom. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all the quotations, because I am sure that they are known to every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the state of the Union address delivered by President Eisenhower on February 2, 1953, together with a letter from President Eisenhower to the President of the Senate, enclosing a draft of a proposed resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpts and draft of resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER FEBRUARY 2, 1953

[Excerpt [1]]

Third. Our policy, dedicated to making the free world secure, will envision all peaceful methods and devices—except breaking faith with our friends. We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves. I shall ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution making clear that this Government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit this kind of enslavement.

B. LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE INCLUDING A DRAFT OF THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION

FEBRUARY 20, 1953.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my message to Congress of February 2, 1953, I stated that I would ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution, making clear that we would never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves, and that we would not feel that any past agreements committed us to any such enslavement.

In pursuance of that portion of the message to Congress, I now have the honor to inform you that I am concurrently informing the Speaker of the House that I invite the concurrence of the two branches of the Con-

[1] H. Doc. 75, 83d Cong., p. 2.

gress in a declaration, in which I would join as President, which would:

(1) Refer to World War II international agreements or understandings concerning other peoples;

(2) Point out that the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party who now control Russia, in violation of the clear intent of these agreements or understandings, subjected whole nations concerned to the domination of a totalitarian imperialism;

(3) Point out that such forceful absorption of free peoples into an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples, including our own;

(4) State that the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage of freedom, have never acquiesced in such enslavement of any peoples;

(5) Point out that it is appropriate that the Congress should join with the President to give expression to the desires and hopes of the American people;

(6) Conclude with a declaration that the Senate and the House join with the President in declaring that the United States rejects any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings, made during the course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples, and further join in proclaiming the hope that the peoples, who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism, shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a frame-work which will sustain the peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

I am enclosing a form of draft resolution, which, in my opinion, carries out the purposes outlined above, and in which I am prepared to concur.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

DRAFT RESOLUTION

Whereas during World War II, representatives of the United States, during the course of secret conferences, entered into various international agreements or understandings concerning other peoples; and

Whereas the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party, who now control Russia, have, in violation of the clear intent of these agreements or understandings, subjected the peoples concerned, including whole nations, to the domination of a totalitarian imperialism; and

Whereas such forcible absorption of free peoples into an aggressive despotism increases the threat against the security of all remaining free peoples including our own; and

Whereas the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage of freedom, are never acquiescent in such enslavement of any peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the Congress join with the President in giving expression to the desires and hopes of the people of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House concurring,

Join with the President in declaring that the United States rejects any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings, made during the course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples, and further

Join in proclaiming the hope that the peoples who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within a framework which will sustain the peace; that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I next call to the attention of the Senate a paragraph in the message which the President of the United States sent to the members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights at the opening of its session on April 7, 1953, in Geneva. I read the pertinent paragraph in the message:

Unfortunately, in too many areas of the world today there is subjugation of peoples by totalitarian governments which have no respect for the dignity of the human person. This denial of the freedom of peoples, the continued disregard of human rights, is a basic cause of instability and discontent in the world today.

Mr. President, that fits in very closely and very fully with what the Acting Secretary of State said, that no subject is foreclosed from discussion at the meeting at the summit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a message which the President of the United States sent to Chancellor Conrad Adenauer, as released by the State Department on June 26, 1953.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have received with deep interest and sympathy your message of June 21. The latest events in East Berlin and Eastern Germany have stirred the hearts and hopes of people everywhere. This inspiring show of courage has reaffirmed our belief that years of oppression and attempted indoctrination cannot extinguish the spirit of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. It seems clear that the repercussions of these events will be felt throughout the Soviet satellite empire.

The United States Government is convinced that a way can and must be found to satisfy the justified aspirations of the German people for freedom and unity, and for the restoration of fundamental human rights in all parts of Germany. It is for the attainment of these purposes that the Government you head and the United States Government have been earnestly striving together. Although the Communists may be forced, as a result of these powerful demonstrations in East Germany to moderate their current policies, it seems clear that the safety and future of the people of Eastern Germany can only be assured when that region is unified with Western Germany on the basis of free elections, as we urged the Soviets to agree to in the notes of September 23, 1952, dispatched by the American, British, and French Governments. It is still our conviction that this represents the only realistic road to German unity, and I assure you that my Government will continue to strive for this goal.

In their hours of trial and sacrifice, I trust that the people of Eastern Germany will know that their call for freedom has been heard around the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a paragraph from the speech of the President of the United States at the Sixth National Assembly of the United Church Women, National Council of Churches of Christ, on October 6, 1953, which deals with the subject matter under discussion.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The mysteries of the atom are known to Russia. Russia's hostility to free government—and to the religious faith on which free government is built—is too well known to require recital here. It is enough for us to know that even before Russia had this awesome knowledge, she by force gained domination over 600 million peoples of the earth. She surrounded them with an Iron Curtain that is an effective obstacle to all intellectual, economic, and spiritual intercourse between the free world and the enslaved world. Now, of these two worlds, the one is compelled by its purpose of world domination, the other by its unbreakable will to preserve its freedom and security to devote these latest discoveries of science to increasing its stockpiles of destructive armaments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the letter written by the President of the United States to one of the leaders of free Polish groups relative to the tyranny which exists within the confines of Communist Poland.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE.—The White House today made public the following letter from the President to the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI:

"DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: I have your letter of October 14 regarding the action taken recently against a courageous leader of his church, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland. The arrest and internment of Cardinal Wyszynski is profoundly discouraging to those of us who look for signs of Communist willingness to respect basic human rights of freedom of thought and conscience. Without evidence of such willingness, it is difficult to believe that the Communist governments intend to honor agreements which might be reached to reduce world tensions. You may recall that I spoke of this in connection with the arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski at my news conference of September 30.

"The calculated repression of all religious organization in the Communist states makes it apparent that wherever Communists are in position to use force and violence, they will do so in an effort to win domination not only over the body and mind of man, but over his soul as well. I share very strongly the conviction which was expressed in the condemnation of the action against Cardinal Wyszynski issued by the Department of State on September 30, that the religious spirit of man will never be subdued or extinguished, and that it will remain a sustaining force in Poland during the present tragic suffering of the Polish people. It is my intention that this Government continue to take all appropriate steps to see to it that Communist violations of the inalienable rights of man under God do not go unopposed, and that they are effectively, exposed in every forum.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I next call to the attention of the Senate a paragraph from the informal address of the President of the United States in a radio broadcast on April 5, 1954, when the President said:

Moreover, there is a growing understanding in the world, of the decency and justice

of the American position in opposing the slavery of any nation. We do not believe that any nation, no matter how great, has a right to take another people and subject them to its rule. We believe that every nation has a right to live its own life. Every bit of aid we give, every cooperative effort we undertake, is all based upon the theory that it is cooperation among equals.

Mr. President, I next call to the attention of the Members of the Senate an excerpt from the speech delivered by the President of the United States at the Columbia University national bicentennial dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, on May 31, 1954, in which the President discussed the importance of negotiations in Germany for the unification of Germany and the freeing of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Germany. The President on that occasion said:

Negotiations to unify Germany have been, for the time being, at least, nullified by Soviet demands for a satellite climate in that country. With respect to Austria, the United States, Great Britain and France agreed to accept State Treaty terms which up to that moment had been acceptable to the Soviet Union. But once this acceptance was announced, the Soviet Union immediately invented new conditions which would enable it, for an indefinite period, to keep military occupation in Austria.

To such a plan we could not agree. Far better, this administration believes, that we end the discussion with the issue still unresolved than to compromise a principle or to accept an agreement whose price might be exacted in blood years hence.

I now call attention to an excerpt from an address delivered by the President at the American Newspaper Publishers Association dinner in New York City on April 22, 1954. The President said:

We cannot hope with a few speeches, a few conferences, a few agreements, to achieve the most difficult of all human goals—a cooperative peace for all mankind. Hear me, I say, my friends, that your representatives in the diplomatic world have no other thought or no other purpose than that which I have just stated: the achievement of a cooperative peace among the free nations and eventually to enlarge that by appealing to the commonsense, representing the facts of the world as they are today to all others, so that even the iron wall must crumble and all men can join together.

I call attention also to the remarks made by the President of the United States on May 31, 1954, at the Columbia University national bicentennial dinner, from which I have already read another excerpt. On that occasion the President also said:

In this situation, we, the American people, stand committed to two far-reaching policies:

First and foremost, we are dedicated to the building of a cooperative peace, based upon truth, justice, and fairness.

Second, to pursue this purpose effectively, we seek the strengthening of America—and her friends—in love of liberty, in knowledge and comprehension, in a dependable prosperity widely shared, and in a military posture adequate for security.

In these two policies, there is no iota of aggression, no intent to exploit others or to deny them their rightful place and space in the world. This consideration of others—this dedication to a world filled with peaceful, self-respecting nations—finds its only opposition in militant totalitarianism.

I next call the attention of the Senate to the speech of the President of the United States at the American Legion convention in Washington, D. C., on Monday, August 30, 1954, in which he said:

A third truth is this: The safety of any single nation in the free world depends directly upon the substantial unity of all nations in the free world. No nation outside the Iron Curtain can afford to be indifferent to the fate of any other nation devoted to freedom.

In the President's state of the Union message in January 1955, the President had this to say:

It is of the utmost importance, then, that each of us understand the true nature of the world struggle now taking place.

It is not a struggle merely of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. The issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the Psalmist describes as a "little lower than the angels," crowned with glory and honor, holding "dominion over the works" of his Creator; or, man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used and consumed by the state for its own glorification.

It is, therefore, a struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit, and its shadow falls across the long sweep of man's destiny. This prize, so precious, so fraught with ultimate meaning, is the true object of the contending forces in the world.

In the past year, there has been progress justifying hope for the ultimate rule of freedom and justice in the world. Free nations are collectively stronger than at any time in recent years.

In a message delivered by the President of the United States in a closed circuit television to 35 meetings throughout the Nation in support of the campaign for Radio Free Europe, under the auspices of the American Heritage Foundation, the President said:

While we maintain our vigilance at home and abroad, we must help intensify the will for freedom in the satellite countries behind the iron curtain. These countries are in the Soviet backyard; and only so long as their people are reminded that the outside world has not forgotten them—only that long do they remain as potential deterrents to Soviet aggression.

The great majority of the 70 million captives in these satellite countries have known liberty in the past. They now need our constant friendship and help if they are to believe in their future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the remarks which the President of the United States made at the 10th anniversary meeting of the United Nations at San Francisco on June 20, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Within a month there will be a Four Power Conference of heads of government. Whether or not we shall then reach the initial decisions that will start dismantling the terrible apparatus of fear and mistrust and weapons erected since the end of World War II, I do not know.

The basis for success is simply put: It is that every individual at that meeting be loyal to the spirit of the United Nations and dedicated to the principles of its charter.

I can solemnly pledge to you here—and to all the men and women of the world who may hear or read my words—that those who represent the United States will strive to be thus loyal, thus dedicated. For us of the United States there is no alternative, because our devotion to the United Nations Charter is the outgrowth of a faith deeply rooted in our cultural, political, spiritual traditions.

Woven into the charter is the belief of its authors—

That man—a physical, intellectual, and spiritual being—has individual rights, divinely bestowed, limited only by the obligation to avoid infringement upon the equal rights of others;

That justice, decency, and liberty, in an orderly society, are concepts which have raised men above the beasts of the field: to deny any person the opportunity to live under their shelter is a crime against all humanity.

Our Republic was born, grew, stands firm today in a similar belief.

The charter assumes that every people has the inherent right to the kind of government under which it chooses to live and the right to select in full freedom the individuals who conduct that government.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, the exchange of communications between the President of the United States and Mr. George Meany, the president of the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

There being no objection, the exchange of communications was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President's message to Mr. Meany and Mr. Reuther sent to them at the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions meeting at Stockholm, read as follows:

"Your message on behalf of the American Trade Union movement sent from the Third World Congress of the International Confederation of Trade Unions is a splendid example of the contributions that free-trade unionism is making to the cause of freedom and justice all over the world. The Government of the United States shares wholeheartedly with you and your associates your feelings about the workers of East Berlin, who by their heroism have demonstrated that totalitarianism has not extinguished the desire for freedom in the enslaved countries of Eastern Europe. I can assure you that this Government will study carefully the proposals you have outlined in your message, with a view to employing every peaceful means to lift the burdens of occupation from the German people."

The message from Mr. Meany and Mr. Reuther to the President sent from Stockholm, read as follows:

"On behalf of 16 million American workers whose representatives are in Stockholm, Sweden, today attending Third World Congress International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, we call upon the Government of the United States immediately to take initiative in aiding workers of Soviet-occupied Germany in their struggle against Soviet totalitarianism. Assembled delegates at ICFTU World Congress, who speak for more than 53 million workers throughout the world have unanimously and with American labor's uncompromising support voted to aid their fellow workers in East Germany in every manner possible. We ask that our Government press for immediate negotiations for free elections in a united Germany for establishment of free political parties and free trade unions and for the immediate liberation of German workers imprisoned by the Soviet occupation authorities for their resistance June 17. We further call for submission of formal complaint to United Na-

tions against the Soviet Union's violation of human rights and freedom of association in Soviet-occupied Germany. In the history of mankind's struggle for liberty, June 17 will go down as memorable moment during which heroic German workers fought not only for themselves, but also battle for all free peoples of the world. Their struggle must have unyielding support of all who cherish freedom. We ask your immediate consideration of our plea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, that has been the record of the President of the United States as to his philosophical beliefs, and, I believe, his very deep convictions.

As I pointed out earlier, this subject has been under discussion in the executive branch of the Government, and I know of my own personal knowledge—I did not make my statement to the Senate without having the approval of the President of the United States to do so—that it has also been under discussion with the majority leader and with others, showing the deep interest the President has had and does now have in this cause.

Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to a statement made by the Secretary of State in a speech he delivered on September 17, 1953. In that speech Secretary Dulles said:

The entire situation in Eastern and Central Europe is bound to be a cause of deep concern. The peoples there are essentially religious people, and they are essentially patriotic people. They have a spiritual faith that is enduring and great traditions which will never be forgotten.

It is not in the interest of peace, or the other goals of the charter, that the once independent peoples of Europe should feel that they can no longer live by their traditions and their faith.

It is charged that unrest only exists among them as it is artificially stimulated from without.

That is true only in the sense that faith is a contagious thing which penetrates even curtains of iron. The American people, like many others, hold to the belief which our founders expressed in the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Also we believe, as Abraham Lincoln put it, that there is "something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time." No peace can be enduring which repudiates the concept that government should rest on free consent or which denies to others the opportunity to embrace that concept. We do not conceal that conviction, and no United States Government could contain it.

Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a radio-television broadcast by Secretary of State Dulles on November 29, 1954.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAPTIVE PEOPLES

There is one final aspect of our policies to which I would allude. We believe, as Abraham Lincoln said, that our Declaration of Independence promises "liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time."

Today, a third of the human race is in fearful bondage to Communist dictatorships. But we do not regard that as immutable.

There is, we know, vast human discontent among the 800 million people whom international communism rules. That comes from the enslavement of labor, the suppression of religion, and of individual initiative and the national humiliation of the satellite countries.

Liberation normally comes from within. But it is more apt to come from within if hope is constantly sustained from without. That we are doing in many ways.

A significant recent development has been the Soviet change of policy toward Yugoslavia. In 1948, Yugoslavia broke free from the grip of international communism and reasserted its own nationalism.

Until recently, the Yugoslav Government and nation were threatened and reviled by the international Communists of neighboring Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria. Now, however, the Soviet Union treats Yugoslavia with deference while it continues to treat with contempt the puppet Governments of Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. That may embolden the satellites to demand a measure of independence.

Developments clearly portend the change, at some time, of the absolute rule which international communism asserts over the once-free nations of Europe and Asia.

(Source: U. S. News & World Report, Dec. 10, 1954, p. 106. Excerpt from radio-television broadcast by Secretary of State Dulles on Nov. 29, 1954.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to read one paargraph from the excerpt which has just been placed in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Liberation normally comes from within. But it is more apt to come from within if hope is constantly sustained from without. That we are doing in many ways.

Mr. President, I have been deeply concerned by the problem presented by the nations which have been forced within the Communist orbit. I was particularly concerned lest there be a misconception in the outside world and that the poor, desperate, enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain might interpret the action of the Senate as indicating that we have lost interest in them, and, therefore, I have made this statement today. I am glad the distinguished majority leader has made the statement he has made, because the people behind the Iron Curtain may rest assured that we have not lost interest in them.

Mr. President, the President of the United States is about to embark on some highly important conferences.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In a moment.

These conferences are not meant to solve in 4 or 5 days all the problems of the world. As I understand them, they are more exploratory in nature, designed to find a way to relieve the tensions which exist. We are not foreclosed in raising the issue of the tensions in the satellite countries, any more than is the Soviet Union foreclosed from raising any points of tension which they may have in mind. But, at least, the Department of State and the President of the United States do have freedom of action to raise those issues, and they are not foreclosed, as the Senator from Wisconsin has feared, by the Pravda report. No one knows what may come from these meetings. We all hope that perhaps there has been some change in the Soviet attitude, although many of us who are skeptical that the Soviet leopard has changed its spots in the slightest. I have made no secret of my beliefs. I am frank to admit that I do not believe as of the present time that the Soviet Union has changed its long-term strategy. But I do admire and respect the President of the United States. I know him to be a great American, a man who has rendered magnificent service to his country in time of war and in time of peace. He has been charged by the American people with the most backbreaking task which has ever been created in any Nation at any time, and the heavy burdens of his office are never far from him.

The Secretary of State is now carrying on some preliminary discussions regarding the mechanics of the Geneva meeting, and, perhaps, of the foreign ministers meetings which will follow. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, anything we might do directly, or even indirectly, which would appear to be casting doubt as to whether the President of the United States meant what he said, when time after time, during the period of the past 2 years, he has made his position clear, as have many of us in this Chamber who have expressed our concern and interest in the people behind the Iron Curtain, would be a grave mistake.

I recognize that men may differ in their viewpoints on this subject, but I have felt, for very compelling and very cogent reasons, that the Members on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle should vote against this resolution and, at the same time, make perfectly clear that we are not in any sense of the word losing one iota of interest in the captive peoples. I am sure the President recognizes the great difficulties which confront him.

Let me close by reminding the Senate of the old proverb that it is better to light a single candle than to curse the darkness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, first, I wish to compliment the Senator on his very able speech and the very fine contribution he has made to the record. I think it is extremely important that all the Members of this body and the citizens of this country and of the world realize that in this resolution there is no real issue of the satellites involved. We all know that their control by the Soviet Union makes for one of the major tensions of our time. Every Member of the Congress, Mr. President, is aware of that. The President is aware of it. The Secretary of State is aware of it. I think the discussions on the subject yesterday in the committee, the discussions on the floor, and, particularly, the able speech by the distinguished minority leader, together with the insertions he has made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will serve a useful purpose.

Mr. President, I have confidence in the integrity and patriotism of the President of this Nation.

I want every Member of the Senate to know it. I want every citizen of the

country, regardless of his party, to know it. I do not think it is necessary, in order to get the President and the Secretary of State to do their plain duty, to have Congress breathing down their necks with a resolution.

I am delighted that my friend from California differs with me only on the procedure in the committee. Of course, there are differences, as differences go, between the majority leader and the minority leader. I do not wish to haggle over this point.

The Senator from California may be in the same position, perhaps not tomorrow or the next day, but someday. Very few votes divide the membership on both sides of the aisle. The senior Senator from California may again be the majority leader. I hope that that will be, perhaps, after he walks across the aisle, rather than because of an increase in membership on the other side of the aisle.

The minority leader stood with me on another occasion in this body. I know how offensive it is to have one's remarks read back to him, because I had that happen to me recently when some of my former statements were read by the very able Senator from Connecticut.

But on August 2, 1954, the senior Senator from California, who was then the majority leader, stood side by side with me in this Chamber. The Senator was replying to inquiries of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and various other Senators, about a substitute resolution to be offered in place of the Flanders resolution. The Senator from California did not then, as I did not on Monday, give assurances of what the Senate would do, because no living person can do that. But I think the Senator from California then felt, just as I felt on Monday, that he would not interpose any objection, and not only that but he was most anxious to do what he could to make certain that every Senator had an opportunity to record himself, but to record himself only after all the evidence had been presented to a select committee, which could study it, evaluate it, and then make a recommendation.

I stood with the Senator from California on that occasion. We made no firm commitment as to our action. But we stated, in response to questions from our colleagues, what we anticipated, and that in itself was an assurance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me to finish my sentence. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am waiting to get the floor, so I insist that only questions be asked.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator from California will realize that when I made my statement I felt just as he did, when he believed the matter was one for the Senate to consider.

Mr. McCARTHY. I call for the regular order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have about concluded my remarks. I reaffirm now what I said at the opening. I think the Senator from Wisconsin was not in the Chamber at the time; he notified me that he had to go temporarily to his office. I may say to the Senator that I expressed my viewpoint.

I believe he has deep interest, conviction, and concern about the people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. I paid my respects to him for what I think is his sincerity of purpose in this matter. I gave what I believed to be not only my understanding and my differences with the distinguished majority leader on procedural matters, but also as to why I believe the President of the United States, over a period of years, has shown a deep interest in the matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator know what is in the amendment to the resolution? Was he talking about the resolution as it was considered by the committee yesterday, or was he speaking about the resolution as it is proposed to be amended, to conform with the views of Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr.?

Mr. KNOWLAND. My remarks were directed primarily to the resolution which the junior Senator from Wisconsin had submitted, and as to which he had asked the majority leader to obtain prompt consideration by the committee.

With respect to the resolution, the Senator from Wisconsin appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday afternoon. I was present during the entire period of time the resolution was under consideration, which was more than 3½ hours. I do not mean to say that the Senator from Wisconsin took 3½ hours; but the committee met in continuous session. I was present and heard the testimony of the Senator from Wisconsin in support of the resolution which he had submitted, and his argument for his resolution was perfectly proper.

Today the junior Senator from Wisconsin has shown me a proposed amendment, in which he has made some changes from time to time, which is the right of any Senator. The amendment indicates it is intended that certain language be stricken. I understand also that certain language has been added.

But my remarks would apply to the substitute or the amendment, as well, because I think that at this particular time in our history, when the administration has laid a basis for its action, the President and the Secretary of State have a vital interest in the matter. The representatives of the administration have made certain representations before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Since the Secretary of State is now in San Francisco, I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to adopt a resolution, however it might be modified here and there, and perhaps every 10 or 15 minutes, because of what might appear to be innocuous, or merely, as the Senator from Wisconsin said, because of a statement which would confirm what I have already said is the President's position, and what Mr. Hoover had indicated with respect to the general humanitarian background, which I think is what he had in mind, and the many consistent statements on the part of the President. It would be a mistake for the Senate to agree to such a resolution now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not at all surprised at the position taken by the majority leader. It is in accord with the long record of the Democrat Party to whine and whimper whenever the red-hot stove of Communist aggression is touched. So I am not at all surprised at the position the Democrat leader took. It is in line with the position taken by his party over the last 20 years.

But I am surprised, shocked, and disappointed, I may say, at the position that the Republican leader takes. It is in complete opposition to the solemn pledges made in the Republican Party platform. It is not the role of the Republican Party to backtrack, to appease, to whine, to whimper. That is the position of the Democrat Party.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin——

Mr. McCARTHY. May I finish?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have the floor at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I finish my statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The junior Senator from Wisconsin is not going to rise on the floor of the Senate and say that the minority leader has been whining and whimpering. I will place my record in opposition to communism and in opposition to the enslavement of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain——

Mr. McCARTHY. Not today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Against that of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I respect the Senator for the interest he has taken in combating communism. I voted against the Senator's resolution in the committee because I felt it was not in accord with correct procedure.

The Senator has no right to say on the floor of the Senate that the senior Senator from California, the minority leader, is whining and whimpering in this regard. I have set forth, according to what I believe to be my best and my honest judgment, what I believe to be the position of the President of the United States, what I believe to be the position of the administration.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I have demonstrated my own position, because I have been subjected to criticism for having differed with the administration on certain approaches in the field of foreign policy.

If I believed there would be anything in the nature of appeasement, or that appeasement would result from the forthcoming conference, I would be the first to rise in the Senate, despite the fact that I occupy the position of minority leader, and make my voice heard. The junior Senator from Wisconsin can make any statement he pleases, but certainly I do not have to accept it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said it was the position of the Democratic Party to whine and whimper whenever they touched the red-hot stove of Communist aggression. I did not say the minority leader whined and whimpered. I said I was surprised, shocked, and disappointed that the minority leader would not go along with the Republican platform, from which I quote:

> It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples.

Our platform was that Congress, as well as the President, would make it clear.

The Senator from California campaigned on that platform. The American people elected us on that platform. They repudiated the Democrat leadership because of that party's appeasement and its retreat from victory.

So I cannot help being disappointed—extremely disappointed—that the Senator from California, who had been the leader in this fight against communism until very recently, is suddenly going back on our solemn contract with the American people. I did not say that the Senator from California whined and whimpered. I said it was the Democrat Party that whined and whimpered when they touched the red hot stove of Communist aggression.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California has been trying to preserve some equanimity here. I shall continue to do so. I will say to the Senator I have expressed my honest judgments as the minority leader of the Senate. I have given my recommendation to the Senate. Each Member of this body, 96 in number, 47 on this side of the aisle, 49 on the other side of the aisle, can make his own decision, based on the facts and on the record.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield before he yields the floor?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield while I offer my amendment so we may know what we are talking about?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have been waiting all afternoon, ever since the Senate convened, to present a report, which had been designated as very urgent, on which the Committee on Foreign Relations worked all day yesterday and until midnight, so the Senate could proceed and not lose time today. So far I have not been able to make the report. If the Senator will yield, I shall not take very long to make the report. Then the Senator from Wisconsin can have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. GREEN. So, Mr. President, if we can get the train back on the rails, I should like to go ahead.

Mr. President, on behalf of a unanimous Committee on Foreign Relations, I presented to the Senate on yesterday an unfavorable report on Senate Resolution 116, which was submitted day before yesterday by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. Let me say at the outset that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has been consulted, and is in entire accord with what has been done.

The pending resolution, in its substantive part, would express the sense of the Senate to be that, prior to any Big Four meeting, the Secretary of State should secure the agreement of the other participants to include discussion of the status of Communist-dominated nations on the agenda of such a meeting. The practical effect of this resolution would be to scuttle the Big Four meeting before it begins.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] submitted the resolution under rather unusual circumstances late on Monday, when only a few Senators were present, and he asked for its immediate consideration at that time, without reference to any committee. The Senator stressed the need for haste, and expressed some doubt that his resolution would be considered if in fact it were referred to a committee. After some discussion, it was agreed that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the majority and minority leaders undertook to seek prompt consideration of the resolution by that committee.

The committee was glad to cooperate, and accordingly, a public hearing was held yesterday afternoon, at which the junior Senator from Wisconsin presented his arguments in favor of the resolution. The committee also heard Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., who urged that the resolution not be approved.

Mr. Hoover pointed out, among other things, that

> In the preliminary conversations that have already taken place regarding arrangements for the conference, it has been agreed that each of the participants would be free to take up any subject which it believed to be a contributory cause of world tensions. The purpose of such an agreement was to eliminate possible arguments on the fixing of a rigid agenda.

The effect of the adoption of this resolution would be precisely the opposite—that is, it would precipitate endless arguments on the fixing of a rigid agenda.

Following the public hearing yesterday afternoon, the committee went into executive session for further consideration of the resolution. I emphasize, Mr. President, that from the first moment there was no disagreement among the members of the committee as to the substantive merits of the resolution. We were unanimous from the beginning that the resolution had no real merit, and that it should not be agreed to under any circumstances.

The only disagreement in the Foreign Relations Committee was as to the procedure which should be followed in disposing of the resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I shall not be long. I prefer not to yield until I complete my statement, and then I shall yield in order to answer any questions which the Senator from Wisconsin may have in mind to ask.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. No; I will not yield.

Some thought the resolution should be tabled by the committee; others felt it should be reported adversely so that the Senate itself could act.

There is much to be said for either point of view. I think the principal question which troubled members of the committee was whether unfavorable action by the Senate might be misinterpreted abroad as indicating lack of interest in the plight of the Soviet captive countries of eastern Europe and Asia. Of course, the Senate is not unmindful of the welfare of the people in these countries, and it has expressed that concern on a number of occasions. Nor is there any reason to believe that the President and the Secretary of State are any less concerned than are the Members of the Senate.

The resolution itself is not so much an expression of interest in the captive countries as it is an expression of lack of confidence in the President and the Secretary of State. An overwhelming vote by the Senate to reject the resolution will mean that the Senate is saying to the world that we trust the man who is President of the United States, and that we disavow efforts to put limitations and restrictions on him as he goes into these exceedingly delicate conferences.

Mr. President, I did not vote for the election of the man who occupies the office of President of the United States. I disapprove of some of the policies which he espouses. But when he sits down with the ruler of the Soviet Union I am going to do everything I can to see that he has every advantage he can possibly have. I am not going to be a party to increasing his difficulties, and I am sure the Senate and most of the American people feel the same way.

Mr. President, it was most unfortunate that this resolution was ever submitted. It is both unnecessary and undesirable and, if acted upon favorably would do incalculable harm, not only to the United States, but also to the cause of world peace. I urge the Senate to vote the resolution down, promptly and overwhelmingly, and thereby to undo, insofar as we can, the damage which has already been done.

I ask unanimous consent, that the report of the committee be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 621) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideraiton a resolution (S. Res. 116) expressing the sense of the Senate that the present and future status of the

nations of Eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control shall be a subject for discussion at any conference between the heads of state of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, report the resolution adversely to the Senate by a vote of 14 to 0 and recommend that it not be agreed to.

GENERAL PURPOSE

This resolution, if adopted against the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations, would express the sense of the Senate that prior to any conference between heads of state, the Secretary of State should secure the agreement of other parties at the conference—the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France—that one of the subjects for discussion should be the present and future status of the nations of eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control.

The Committee on Foreign Relations recommends against adoption of the resolution because, among other reasons, it would unduly restrict the freedom of the President of the United States in the conduct of international negotiations of vital interest to the security of this Nation, and it would have the effect of expressing a lack of confidence in the President at a critical juncture in world history when American unity in foreign affairs is particularly important.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

The text of the resolution is as follows:

"[S. Res. 116, 84th Cong., 1st sess.]

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress and more particularly the Senate, has concurrent responsibility with the executive branch for the formulation of the international policies of the United States; and

"Whereas the safety, peace, and independence of the United States are seriously threatened by the aggressive world Communist movement under the leadership of the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the United States is pledged to seek the freedom of the millions of people who have already been enslaved by the world Communist movement; and

"Whereas the safety, peace, and independence of the United States can never be permanently secured, nor the goal of the United States to obtain the freedom of oppressed peoples realized, so long as certain areas of the world remain under Communist control; namely, Estonia; Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Eastern Germany, Northern Korea, Northern Indochina, China, and the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the President has determined to confer with the heads of state of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France at Geneva, Switzerland, on July 18, 1955, with the objective of relieving world tensions and thus of attempting to make more secure the safety, peace, and independence of the United States; and

"Whereas the government of the Soviet Union announced on June 13, 1955, and on several occasions prior thereto, that the subject of areas under Communist control would not be discussed by the Soviet Union at said conference between the heads of state; and

"Whereas failure to discuss said areas under Communist control at said Geneva meeting implies dejure recognition of Communist domination of said areas and thus the establishment of a permanent threat to the safety, peace, and independence of the United States; and

"Whereas the Secretary of State is meeting with the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France beginning June 20, 1955, at San Francisco, reportedly to discuss, inter alia, an agenda for the conference between the heads of state: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that at said Foreign Ministers' meeting at San Francisco or at such other meeting or occasion as may be appropriate, prior to any such conference between the heads of state, the Secretary of State should secure the agreement of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France that the present and future status of the nations of Eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control shall be a subject for discussion at such conference between the heads of state."

COMMITTEE ACTION

Senate Resolution 116 was introduced by Senator McCARTHY on June 20, 1955. At the request of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the committee undertook to consider the resolution without delay.

Accordingly, on June 21, 1955, the committee held a public hearing on the resolution at which Senator McCARTHY urged its favorable consideration and Hon. Herbert Hoover, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, expressed the administration's opposition. The prepared statement of Acting Secretary of State Hoover is appended to the report for the information of the Senate. The committee subsequently met in executive session and the resolution was discussed at length.

It was moved that the resolution be reported to the Senate and that the Committee on Foreign Relations recommend that it not be agreed to. A substitute motion was offered to table Senate Resolution 116 in the committee. The motion to table was defeated by a vote of 8 to 7. Thereupon the committee voted to report the resolution to the Senate and recommend that it not be agreed to.

REASONS FOR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

During committee consideration of the pending resolution, the following principal reasons were offered against its adoption:

1. Approval of the resolution would imply a lack of confidence on the part of Members of the Senate in the ability of the President of the United States to carry out his constitutional role in the conduct of foreign policy and to represent our country effectively in the forthcoming top-level conference. Moreover, such an action taken now, on the eve of the conference, would raise grave doubts in the minds of the people of other countries as to the singleness of purpose with which this Nation pursues its objective of world peace.

2. The resolution would seem to be based on the assumption that the President and the Secretary of State are less mindful of the interests of the unfortunate people behind the Iron Curtain than is the Senate. The committee did not believe it was necessary for the Senate to remind the President and the Secretary of State of the deep concern which Americans have felt for more than a decade at the enslavement of people in Communist-dominated lands.

3. The committee believed it would be unwise to require agreement with the Soviet Union upon a specific agenda item as a condition precedent to United States participation in the forthcoming Big Four Conference. Assurances were received from the Acting Secretary of State, Herbert Hoover, Jr., in his testimony before the committee, to the effect that "in the preliminary conversations that have already taken place regarding arrangements for the Conference, it has been agreed that each of the participants would be free to take up any subject which it believed to be a contributory cause of world tensions."

Members of the committee agreed, therefore, that the pending resolution would be meaningless if not actually harmful. Its adoption would tend to give priority to discussion of one subject and by implication subordinate the discussion of other highly important matters such as disarmament and the future of Germany.

4. Under these circumstances, it was pointed out that in all probability the status of the people behind the Iron Curtain is a problem which will be considered at the forthcoming conference. It would be quite another matter, however, for the United States to insist in advance that this question should be the subject of discussion in any formal sense. In fact, there is a possibility that insistence on inclusion of this specific item might result in cancellation of the conference even before it becomes possible to explore Soviet intentions with respect to world peace.

5. Past experience in negotiating with the Soviet Union has indicated that considerable difficulty often arises in connection with determining items to be placed on the agenda. The committee believed there is a very real danger that the Soviet Union might seek some method of delaying or avoiding the meeting of the scheduled conference and blaming the United States for the breakdown of negotiations even prior to the agenda-fixing stage. Adoption of this resolution might provide such an excuse.

6. The committee believed it would be a serious mistake to require the President to attend a conference with his flexibility of negotiation restricted by the provisions of the pending resolution. The committee knows that the representative of the Soviet Union will not operate under a similar restriction and does not want the President of the United States to be unduly handicapped in these discussions.

7. Approval of this resolution could have the effect, in the event the conditions set forth are not agreed to by the Soviet Union, of preventing the United States from participating in the forthcoming conference. Furthermore, if the conference were canceled for this reason, world public opinion might be inclined to blame the United States for blocking progress in the direction of world peace.

8. While passage of this resolution might endanger the holding of the conference, failure to approve the resolution does not in any way foreclose the freedom of the President to raise such matters as he may find appropriate at the conference.

COMMITTEE CONCLUSIONS

The committee desires to have it clearly understood that its action in recommending against adoption of the pending resolution should not be construed as arising from any lack of interest in the welfare of the people of the nations now under Communist control. Indeed, the committee has on numerous occasions in past years approved resolutions enabling the Senate to go on record in support of the aspirations of these peoples for freedom and independence.

The committee hopes it will be possible for the representatives of the United States to bring the status of the people in the Soviet-dominated countries to the attention of the Conference. It is convinced that their status is one which is of the utmost concern to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State as it is to the Members of the Senate. It may well be one of the subjects which would undoubtedly lead to a reduction of international tensions in the event of successful negotiations.

It is the purpose of the forthcoming Big Four meeting to delineate the areas of tension in the world. It cannot be expected that the conference will itself lead to immediate settlement of the vast range of areas of disagreement between the free world and the Communist world. Indeed, it may be years before some of the matters discussed at that meeting will be finally settled. Nevertheless, a start must be made In the opinion of the committee it would be a tragic mistake if precipitate action taken by the Senate now were to endanger in any way the possible success of this effort which may lead to a new era in international relations.

Any attempt by the Senate at this time to set forth specific matters to be discussed at the conference would unduly hamper and restrict the President in his negotiations. He must be as free as the other representatives at the conference to raise any questions which may possible be productive of a peaceful future in which the area of freedom in the world may be expanded.

The Committee on Foreign Relations takes this occasion to express its complete confidence in the President of the United States and in the Secretary of State. It has no doubt of their capacity and their ability to express effectively the views of the American people and to negotiate successfully with the representatives of the other powers which will meet in Geneva on next July 18.

For the reasons outlined above, the committee believes it would be in the national interest for the Senate to reject the pending resolution.

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE HERBERT HOOVER, JR., BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE CONCERNING SENATE RESOLUTION 116, JUNE 21, 1955

I refer to the request of the Foreign Relations Committee for the comments of the Department of State on Senate Resolution 116, which expresses the sense of the Senate that prior to any conference between the heads of government of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union, the Secretary of State secure the agreement of the representatives of the other three nations that the present and future status of the nations of Eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control shall be a subject for discussion at such a conference between the heads of government.

The position of the United States on this subject is well known. The Congress, the President, and the Secretary of State have many times clearly and forcefully expressed the hope that all people, everywhere, may exercise their inalienable rights to a government of their own choice and a life in which the dignity of man is paramount.

In his television report to the President after his return from Vienna, the Secretary of State had this to say about the pending conference: "It may at least set up new processes for a solution of some of these great problems—problems like the unification of Germany, the problem of levels of armament, the problem of atomic weapons, the problem of the satellite countries, the problems created by international communism."

In the preliminary conversations that have already taken place regarding arrangements for the conference, it has been agreed that each of the participants would be free to take up any subject which it believed to be a contributory cause of world tensions. The purpose of such an agreement was to eliminate possible arguments on the fixing of a rigid agenda. It will be remembered that, at the Palais Rose Conference in 1951, 4 months of intense discussion failed to achieve agreement upon an agenda. There have been numerous repetitions of this same situation upon other occasions. The proposed resolution calls for a prior agreement on the subjects for discussion, as a prerequisite for the holding of the conference. Under the circumstances, I do not believe that a procedure such as suggested in this resolution would be advisable.

I feel certain that the President and the Secretary of State are in complete sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objectives of Senate Resolution 116. I believe, however, that it is desirable and necessary to rely on the judgment and ability of the President and the Secretary of State to carry on this conference pursuant to their responsibilities. To adopt this or similar resolutions could suggest, and might be misinterpreted as, establishing preconditions to these important and delicate discussions.

Mr. GREEN. Now, Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I shall take the floor on my own time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I believe that every American from the President down, would be happy if, as a result of the Big Four conference which is scheduled to be held in Geneva on July 18, an agreement could be reached with the Soviet Union which could give added freedom or hope for freedom to the citizens of all nations now under Communist domination. I am sure that if, after the conference opens, President Eisenhower sees any hope of furthering such a cause, he will take whatever action he thinks might bring that hope nearer to reality during the conference.

At the same time, however, I cannot agree that we should bind the President in advance, to making Russian agreement to such a discussion a firm condition precedent to the discussion of any other subject, and I think that is what adoption of Senate Resolution 116 would require.

I have faith in President Eisenhower in his understanding of the problems of satellite peoples and of the enslaved people of the Soviet Union itself and to his devotion to the principles of justice and freedom. I want to do anything I can to strengthen his hand at the conference and will not do anything which by the greatest stretch of the imagination could be interpreted anywhere in the world as a limitation on his power to negotiate or as an expression of lack of faith in his intentions or his ability.

I cannot accept the premise that failure to require the President to take this action is de jure recognition of the Russian position. This premise assumes that we agree with the Russian position on every subject not specifically included in the discussions, premise which is ridiculous on its face.

Therefore, I shall vote against the resolution, not because I do not agree with its objectives, but because I cannot ask the President to carry the burden of its implications.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should prefer to say what I have to say when the majority leader is present, because I wish to talk of the procedure and the way this whole matter was handled, rather than about the resolution itself. He will be present in a minute. I think I shall proceed——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have a statement which will take about 2 minutes. If the Senator is willing to yield, I shall be glad to make my statement now.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to yield that much time, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suggest that we are wasting a great deal of time discussing the resolution that was acted on yesterday by the Foreign Relations Committee, in view of the fact that I now wish to amend the resolution. If the Senator from Indiana will yield to me, let me say that it seems to me that the orderly procedure——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I may do so without losing the floor, I yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin, to permit him to submit the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. And to have it read, please.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; and to have it read, but without making any comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The suggested amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the present language of the resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

Whereas the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., on June 21, 1955, informed the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as follows: "I feel certain that the President and the Secretary of State are in complete sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate is also in sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116, and the Senate hopes that the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116, namely, securing the freedom of the Communist-controlled satellite nations enumerated therein, will be pursued by the President at the forthcoming Geneva meeting between the heads of state.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have read the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. The brief remarks I have to make at this time apply both to the amendment and to the original resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been read, but has not yet been offered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I so understand, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I come from one of the older sections of our country. It is on the Atlantic seaboard. In early days the people of that section came in contact with and negotiated with the older nations of Europe. Massachusetts was one of the 13 colonies which adopted the Constitution of the United States under which we live today. But that Constitution, the Chief Executive is necessarily given the power to negotiate agreements with other nations and, wide latitude is properly left to him, subject only to ratification by the Senate of the United States treaties before they can become binding upon our country.

It is with this background that I wish to make the following brief statement, which expresses my deep convictions on this occasion:

The peoples and the governments of the world dwell today in worried uncertainty; yet at the same time they entertain and nourish every possible hope for world peace, for greater security for all, and for ever larger opportunities for every individual.

In great degree as a result of this universal anxiety, there is now scheduled for the 18th of July, next, in the city of Geneva, Switzerland, a long-discussed and currently planned meeting of the heads of state and the foreign ministers of France, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and

the United States, to explore ways and means of lessening international tensions.

The announced purpose of the meeting is, not to arrive at final and irrevocable decisions, but, rather, to establish procedures for determining how existing international tensions may be relieved. It is the declared intention of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to attend the meeting.

I should like to express to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State my deeply sincere good wishes in this endeavor and my firm confidence that the President and the Secretary of State, serving, as they are, in the finest American tradition, will meet fully and firmly their personal and official responsibilities under our Constitution.

I wish to express equal confidence in the heartfelt determination of the President and the Secretary of State to urge the carrying forward of every possible enterprise which may lead ultimately to greater security for ourselves and for all peoples and to ever-wider opportunities for peace throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, so that I may ask a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; if I may obtain unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe I am correct when I say that I understand that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] campaigned for election to the Senate in 1952, and did so upon the Republican platform. I wish to ask whether the Senator from Massachusetts is aware of the fact that the Republican platform on which he campaigned contains the following provision:

> It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples.
>
> We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. That program will give the Voice of America a real function. It will mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of "containment" which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and Godless terrorism which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction.

Keeping in mind that that was a part of the platform upon which the Senator from Massachusetts campaigned—namely, that the Congress would make clear its position on that subject—does not the Senator agree with me that any Republican Senator who now refuses to vote for a resolution saying we will make that clear, is doing a disservice to his party?

The Democratic Senators can vote against the resolution because they had no such campaign platform. But the Republican Senators made that campaign pledge, and it was a solemn contract with the American people; namely, that the Congress would make clear its position. Today, I am giving the Republican Senators a chance, to some extent at least, to live up to that campaign pledge.

Does not the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that any Republican Senator who fails to live up to that campaign pledge is doing a disservice to the Republican Party?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I request the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will permit me to do so, I shall be glad to answer the question of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I may do so without losing the floor, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts, to permit him to answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair wishes to inform the visitors who are in the galleries that they are here as the guests of the Senate, and must keep as quiet as possible while the proceedings are going on.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana for yielding to me.

My answer to the Senator from Wisconsin is that I believe I am doing my utmost to carry out the pledge of the Republican Party which he read, and on which I campaigned, when I give the President of the United States, the elected President of all the people, the widest possible latitude to negotiate in the best interests of the United States, and thus in the best interests of obtaining peace in the world, and when I vote against any resolution prior to the President's attendance at the conference. I reserve the right to vote as I see fit on any agreement which at a later time may come before the Senate. In that way, I believe I am living squarely up to the terms of the Constitution and to my oath as a United States Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky wishes to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If I may do so without losing the floor, I yield for that purpose to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment to the resolution, which has just been read at the desk, was read merely for the information of the Senate, was it not? The amendment itself was not offered, was it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the amendment was not offered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the resolution, is it now in order for any Senator to offer an amendment to the resolution, which including the preamble, was reported adversely? In other words, under the rules, is it in order to offer an amendment to any part of the resolution other than the text of the resolution itself, but not to the preamble, which must be agreed to after the resolution itself is adopted, if it is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the preamble is not before the Senate, and that it cannot be acted upon by itself in any form until and unless the resolution is adopted.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, unless the resolving part of the document is adopted by the Senate, it will not be in order to offer an amendment to the preamble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or an amendment which would include an amendment to the preamble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that no amendment can be offered to the preamble at this stage.

Mr. BARKLEY. And none will be in order until and unless the resolution itself is adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sure that I understand the Chair. Is it the position of the Chair that it is not in order to offer an amendment to the resolution at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; but it is not in order to offer an amendment to the preamble.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I understand. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, perhaps I am much concerned about the subject which I am about to discuss. Perhaps I am taking the question too seriously. However, I think I can say what I am about to say without fear of being misunderstood, for the reason that, prior to the time the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, voted on this question, I publicly stated, in the presence of representatives of the press and others, that I was opposed to the McCarthy resolution and would vote against it. I gave my reasons, in questioning the able junior Senator from Wisconsin. Therefore, no one can mistake my position. I voted against the resolution in the committee. I shall vote against it on the floor, because I do not believe it to be necessary.

However, that is not the purpose of my rising to speak at this time. I want

the record to show that I think the Foreign Relations Committee made a grave mistake yesterday. I think perhaps we have established a precedent which will return to haunt us. I want the RECORD to show that yesterday the Foreign Relations Committee, with every member being opposed to the resolution, and so stating, there being no question in the mind of any member of the committee as to where he stood, voted to report the resolution to the Senate adversely.

If we are to establish such a precedent, and if we are to permit a Senator to rise on the floor any time he cares to do so, and say, "I wish to introduce a bill," or "I wish to submit a resolution out of order," and demand that it be handled immediately and it is referred to a committee, and, even though the committee is unanimously opposed to it, insist that it come to the floor of the Senate for a vote, we shall get into a great deal of trouble, in my opinion.

I have been a Member of the United States Senate for 11 years. If my observation and memory serve me correctly, the only time in my experience in the Senate that a bill reported adversely, was when Senators were in doubt; when there was a division among members of a committee as to whether or not a certain measure should be reported, meaning that they could not make up their own minds as to whether they should vote for it or against it. But when the action of the committee is unanimous, as the action in the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday was, the situation is a little different. A motion was made in committee to table the resolution. The vote was 8 to 7 against tabling; and it was demanded that the resolution be reported to the Senate adversely and be acted upon by the Senate. I say that we established a precedent yesterday which will return to haunt us.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that I disagree with the Senator in his statement that the committee established a precedent by refusing to table a resolution, and by reporting it adversely. On numerous occasions in the past, committees of the Senate have reported adversely on bills, resolutions, nominations, and other matters submitted to them. But does not the Senator believe that, under the circumstances surrounding the submission of this resolution, and in view of the problems with which it deals, if the Committee on Foreign Relations had bottled up the resolution in the committee by adopting a motion to table, the charge would already have been made—and the committee would be on the defensive—that it had been unwilling to allow the Senate itself to vote on the resolution, and had bottled it up in committee by a motion to table?

Mr. CAPEHART. The same argument could be made with respect to every piece of legislation which is handled by a committee of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not every bill which is introduced, or every resolution which is submitted to a committee, is submitted under the circumstances surrounding this resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have established a precedent for each of the 96 Senators to do the same thing the junior Senator from Wisconsin did; namely, to rise on the floor of the Senate and say, "I want this measure handled immediately." Let me ask this question: Why was the resolution referred to the Foreign Relations Committee if it was intended to have the Senate vote upon it?

Mr. BARKLEY. All the committees are servants of the Senate. They are not masters of the Senate. They are agencies for the consideration of legislation. The resolution was referred to the committee, of course, for the purpose of allowing the committee to consider it and determine what to do with it. Theoretically, the Senate has a right to pass upon proposed legislation submitted to committees, whether they report favorably or adversely. As a matter of custom, the Senate usually follows the recommendations of its committees. However, frequently a committee takes no action on a bill, or votes not to report it in an affirmative way; or it may vote to table it. But theoretically, the object of getting a bill or resolution before a committee is to have the committee consider it and report back to the Senate one way or another, as to whether or not it should be enacted in the case of a bill, or adopted in the case of a resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question that committees have the right to do so. But in this instance the action was unanimous. If the committee had voted unanimously to table the resolution, that would have meant that it did not even consider the resolution of sufficient importance to bring it to the floor of the Senate.

The only point I am trying to make is that what the junior Senator from Wisconsin did, 95 other Senators can do. If I rise in my place in the Senate tomorrow to introduce a bill or submit a resolution, and ask that I be permitted to do so out of order, will the able majority leader show me the same consideration in seeing that the proposed legislation is referred to a committee, and that the committee, even though it unanimously votes against the bill or resolution, reports it to the Senate? Will the majority leader show me the same courtesy in seeing that my piece of proposed legislation comes back to the floor of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot speak for the majority leader, but I suggest that if a resolution submitted under the same circumstances were regarded as of the same importance as the resolution which we are considering, I am quite certain the same procedure would be followed.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator assumes that it would be regarded as of the same importance as the pending resolution. So far as I am concerned, there is no importance to the resolution, because every member of the committee voted against it. That should have ended the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. It could not, because the Senator from Wisconsin could have risen in his place today and moved to discharge the committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course he could have done so. That course can be followed with respect to any piece of proposed legislation which a committee considers, and which it decides not to report to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Tabling the resolution in the committee could not have settled the question at all, and it could not have deprived any Senator of the right to seek the opportunity to vote his own sentiments on it. If the committee were unanimously against it, theoretically it might be true that the Senate would be unanimously against it, though I doubt it. But every Senator has the same right to seek an opportunity to vote his own sentiments on any question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, do Senators wish to break the precedents relating to committees? Perhaps I am taking this matter too seriously. Perhaps I ought not to be calling it to the attention of the Senate. However, I say to Senators that we are breaking down the committee system of the Senate. Why do Senators want to do that?

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations knew yesterday that if they reported the resolution adversely probably no Senators, or, at any rate, very few would be in favor of it. Of course, I do not know how many Senators will vote against it. However, the resolution did not even warrant being referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask a question for my own information. I understand that the position of the Senator from Indiana is that there are no precedents for the action taken in connection with this resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. I said there was precedent, but in my experience of 11 years in the Senate when a bill or resolution is adversely reported by a committee, it means that the committee itself was unable to make up its mind whether it was right or wrong in voting for or against the measure.

Of course, it has been done in the past. However, I do not know whether it has ever been done in a case when every member of the committee was opposed to a measure, and when every member of the committee said he was opposed to it. What was the purpose of bringing the resolution before the Senate today, when not one bill or resolution out of thousands which are reported adversely by unanimous vote of a committee come before the Senate? What was the purpose? Was the purpose to have a field day?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I first wish to find out what the Senator's position is with regard to the precedents. As I understand, there are dozens of precedents.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would say that in more than 160 years there probably are some, but very few.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe we are breaking down the committee system, as the Senator has stated. The Senator

cannot have it both ways. Either there are precedents or there are no precedents. I checked on the subject with the Parliamentarian, and I understand that there are dozens of precedents of committees having reported measures adversely to the Senate.

The Senator also raised the question as to the purpose the committee had in mind yesterday in reporting the resolution to the Senate. I can tell the purpose of my vote for reporting it adversely. It was because time was of the essence. I did not think the Senate should be put in such a position that it could be charged that we were unwilling to have the resolution voted on. I believe the entire Senate has an interest in the resolution and should be given an opportunity to vote on it. The Senator and I may disagree as to the question of policy, and he is certainly entitled to his point of view, but I do not want the RECORD to show that the committee followed a course of action for which there was no precedent in the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not say it was without precedent. I do ask why it was done. I do know that in every prior instance it was done because a committee was unable to make up its mind. In this case the vote on the resolution in committee was unanimous. There was no question about the attitudes of members of the committee. A motion was made to table, and the vote on that motion was 7 to 8. My question is, When every Member, including every Republican and every Democrat, was against the resolution, why was it reported? I say the committee established a precedent; if not a precedent, at least it established an incident or situation yesterday which will plague the Senate in the years to come.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully that I still hope majority rule prevails in the Senate. What happened yesterday was that the majority of the committee thought the Senate ought to have an opportunity to vote on the resolution. It is as simple as that.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not quite so simple as that, because there exists the other situation also, in that the majority leader came to the committee and talked and talked to the committee and insisted that the resolution be handled as it finally was.

Mr. BARKLEY. The appearance of the majority leader before the committee was at the invitation of the committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection to it. However, I do want the RECORD to show that I was against the resolution yesterday, and I am still against it. I said so. There was no hesitancy on my part in saying so. I also want the RECORD to show that there was an unusual handling of this resolution. I should like to know why. Is it to put somebody on the spot? Why?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator from Indiana believe there was an unusual handling of the resolution because of its unusual subject matter? It appeals to the judgment and the conscience of every Senator. It is an effort to invoke the "advise" constitutional jurisdiction of the Senate. Even though 15 Members of the Senate, as members of one of its important committees, voted unanimously, as I understand they did, against the pending resolution, is it not still an important matter to each of the other Members of the Senate to have an opportunity to express his judgment and his conscience on this matter?

Is it not likewise important to the country and to the President and to all the representatives who will represent us in the forthcoming important conference in Geneva, to know whether the Senate as a whole, and by what majority, sustains the judgment of those 15 able Members who said that, so far as they were concerned, their judgment and their conscience were against the pending resolution?

Does not the Senator from Indiana believe it is important, likewise, and a matter of individual right to each Senator, to express for himself whether in his conscience and in his judgment he approves or disapproves of the resolution?

Mr. CAPEHART. The record speaks for itself, but let me say that in the Foreign Relations Committee—and I believe the record will speak almost as strongly, when a vote is taken this afternoon—only one Senator considered this resolution of any importance whatsoever, and that was the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I believe the record of the committee shows that, and that the vote in the Senate today will show it also. My question is, Why did the members of the committee break down the custom of the Senate? Why did they insist, when the resolution was unanimously opposed by every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that it be brought to the floor of the Senate and debated today, as it is being debated, instead of getting rid of it in a hurry? If every member of the committee was opposed to it, why so much credence put in it? Why was it even considered?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. In my opinion, it is not worth considering. I am against it. I have confidence in the President and in Mr. Dulles. My question is, Why did the members of the committee want to have the resolution considered by the Senate?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I wish to say that I rather appreciate the comments of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Therefore, acting in all good faith, I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Indiana in my own way. I believe there is a little bit of political needling going on here.

Mr. CAPEHART. On the part of whom?

Mr. BENDER. The Senator can use his own judgment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question that politics was played and is being played by those who insisted on bringing the pending resolution to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. In a moment I shall yield. I wish to repeat what I said. If any politics was being played, it was being played by those who insisted on making a field day out of something that should have been thrown into the trash can last night.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from Indiana believe that every Member of the Senate wishes to express his conscience and his judgment on this important question?

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps that is a fact. But there have been many times when I would have liked to express an opinion and to vote on very controversial questions, some of which were very dear to the able Senator from Florida—civil rights legislation, for instance. But I was denied the right to vote because the bill was bottled up in committee. Senators did something yesterday which some day may come home to plague them.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note that in his preliminary remarks the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said that time is of the essence in this matter. Is there any other way, except by a resounding vote, permanently to dispose of the matter, so that it will not be left to the Senator from Wisconsin or to anyone else to make a motion to bring out this resolution from the committee, tomorrow, or next month? Is there any other way to dispose of it except by having the Senate, as a whole, vote upon it?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Florida knows that the junior Senator from Wisconsin can tack his resolution onto every bill introduced in the Senate from now until we adjourn. We simply broke down the custom of committees.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I can read the RECORD correctly, what the Senator from Wisconsin wanted was for the Senate of the United States to have a chance to vote on the question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why give the Senator from Wisconsin everything he wants? Why pay so much attention to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to see that the Senate is giving the Senator what he wants in this matter. The Senator from Wisconsin wanted it, and every Senator has the right to say "yea" or "nay" upon it. I think the committee did a very wise thing in refusing to bottle up the resolution and insisting on bringing it to the floor where we shall be able to say "yea" or "nay" and finally to dispose of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the able Senator willing this afternoon, or tomorrow, to

see the same procedure followed by any other Senator on any other subject?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then why favor the junior Senator from Wisconsin, when practically every Member of the Senate is opposed to his resolution, and each of the 15 members of the Foreign Relations Committee is opposed to it?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this matter is not an ordinary matter; it is not a usual matter. It is not a joint resolution or a bill or proposed statute which will have to go to the President for his signature. It calls solely for an expression of the judgment of the Senate. Even if the Senator from Indiana feels that he discharged his full duty by voting as he did yesterday, I think that with his usual generosity he should realize that other Senators want to vote on it, and this is the only way to do it——

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, many Senators on many occasions would like to have a right to vote on proposed legislation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure it will be gratifying to know that all Senators may have an opportunity to express themselves on FEPC legislation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I presume that the majority party, with reference to civil rights and every other piece of legislation which may be proposed, will insist that even though a committee votes against it, it should be reported to the Senate and Senators should be given the right to vote on it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The FEPC measure has been reported and has been debated. I believe that I spent 6 hours on it on one occasion, and I am prepared to do so again. But there was no desire to bottle it up in committee, so that neither the Senator from Indiana nor I could be heard. Here is a matter having to do with an important question of national policy in foreign affairs, addressed solely to the judgment and consciences of Senators.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no interest in this resolution, because practically every Senator will vote against it. Every member of the committee voted against it. So there is no interest in it on the part of Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear the Senator make that statement, but I think the country will be better satisfied to hear the Senators answer "yea" or "nay" when their names are called. I believe Senators wish to have their names called and to be recorded on the resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is that we established a new custom yesterday. If I rise on the floor and submit a resolution or introduce a bill and say that I wish it handled immediately—and I am just as sincere about my resolution or bill as is the junior Senator from Wisconsin—is the majority going to insist that even though every member of the committee to which it is referred votes against it, it must come to the floor so that Senators may have an opportunity to vote upon it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is not the Senator from Indiana afraid that by bringing up the FEPC he is injecting politics into the debate?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. Politics has already been injected into it.

Mr. President, I shall not take any more of the time of the Senate. It may be that I am not warranted in being serious about this question. Perhaps no harm has come from it. I hope not. But I did wish to make the record. I am not criticizing any Senator. I think the able majority leader has done very well in his handling of the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. But I am opposed, and I think every other Senator ought to be opposed, to the Senate taking action on a proposal to which a committee is unanimously opposed, and insisting on violating the precedents and rules of the Senate. I think it was unfortunate, and I think it was unnecessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will look at the calendar which is on his desk he will see that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service adversely reported a nomination which was before that committee for consideration. That is not infrequent in connection with a nomination, or in connection with matters of high national importance on which Senators feel they should be recorded. I refer to the case of the postmaster at Edgard, La. The committee felt it was sufficiently important to have the Senate act on the nomination. The committee acted on the nomination adversely. It was passed over this morning because there may be some debate concerning it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it customary for the majority leader to go before a committee and ask, when he knows every member of the committee is opposed to a resolution, that it be reported to the floor of the Senate unfavorably?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, first of all, the majority leader did not go before a committee. The majority leader was called and asked if he would come to the committee, by a unanimous vote, I am told by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I want to make that perfectly clear.

In the second place, it is not customary to submit a resolution in the evening, when it involves foreign policy, and demand action by Thursday, and then have the Senate do nothing about it.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin is able, astute, and versatile enough to get a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment at any time he chooses to do so; and no one understands that better than does the Senator from Indiana. The junior Senator from Wisconsin informed me that that was exactly what he expected to do.

I asked him to wait until we could get the recommendation of our experts in that field. He agreed to do so.

The majority leader would have been in this strange position if he had followed any course save the one he followed: The junior Senator from Wisconsin might have said, "On Monday evening the majority leader agreed that the resolution would be referred to the committee. He said he had no desire to prevent any Senator from recording himself on it. But as soon as he had got the resolution in to the safe habitat of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the 'striped pants' boys from the State Department lowered the boom on it. So the resolution is exactly where all the rest of my resolutions are. Senators do not have the right to vote on it, and the country does not have the right to see where their Senators stand."

Mr. President, I have been through the kindergarten. I knew what the Senator from Wisconsin might have said the next day if I had engaged in any maneuvering or in any clever tactics to take the broom and sweep the resolution under the rug.

I wanted to protect the President of the United States more than I wanted to protect any individual Senator. So far as I am informed, there are very few individual members who are not willing, with their chins up and chests out, to march down the line and say, "This is what I believe about the resolution."

Mr. CAPEHART. I stated that publicly to the press—every member of it—at the beginning of my talk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Indiana object to every other Senator having the same right?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection whatsoever, except that the majority leader broke the custom.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, no.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why does the Senator give the able junior Senator from Wisconsin all that he asks for? Will the Senator from Texas give me the same consideration? Will he do the same for me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It depends on what the Senator asks for.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why does the majority leader pay so much attention to the junior Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It depends on what the Senator asks. I do not recall many instances when I have not gone along with the Senator from Indiana on purely procedural matters. He is a delightful person and a very progressive Senator. I was amazed last year at the fine work done by his committee, as I told him on several occasions. He and the late Senator Maybank, of South Carolina, one of my most beloved friends, were most cooperative.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They achieved great accomplishments for the country. I should be inclined to go along with the Senator if his requests were fair.

Mr. CAPEHART. I like the majority leader, and I appreciate his compliments; but let us get back to the subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The subject was, Would the Senator from Texas do what the Senator from Indiana wanted him to do? Until the Senator from Texas is informed of the wishes of the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Texas is unable to reply. But I simply wanted to say that I have a very high opinion of the able Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Texas knows he could not comply with the requests of 95 other Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That would depend upon the requests. I would try my best to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. The majority leader knows that under the committee system, proposed legislation is referred to committees. The majority leader rightly insisted on the floor of the Senate, the night before last, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for its consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Indiana know what the majority leader was told when he did so?

Mr. CAPEHART. Just a minute. I was not present on Monday evening, but I have read the RECORD. I think every Senator understood that if the committee voted unfavorably, that would end the matter; if the committee voted to table the resolution, that would end the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; there was no statement to that effect. The Senator from Indiana has not read the RECORD carefully. When the Senator from Texas suggested that the resolution be referred to the committee, he was reminded by the distinguished author of the resolution that the Senator from Wisconsin had also had other measures referred to that committee, of which the Senator from Indiana is a member. The majority leader was reminded of the votes in that committee; and the reason the junior Senator from Wisconsin did not want his resolution to be referred to the committee was that he felt the committee would not take action.

I take a lot of criticism, but I never thought for a moment that the majority leader, who represents the Democratic Party, would be publicly criticized by Republicans for complying with a demand from the other side of the aisle for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. CAPEHART. There was no demand to be given a yea-and-nay vote. The majority leader insisted that the regular procedure or routine be followed, and that the resolution be referred to the committee. If it was not intended to have the Senate abide by the decision of the committee, when every member of the committee was opposed to the resolution, why was the resolution referred to the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Because the Senator from Texas said, then and there, that he wanted recommendations from the committee, whatever those recommendations might be.

Mr. CAPEHART. The committee made its recommendations. It said, "We are against the resolution."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express the hope that the Senate is prepared to follow those recommendations.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel certain the Senate will. I know the senior Senator from Indiana will follow them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot understand why the Senator from Indiana objects to following the recommendations of his own committee, and to permitting the entire Senate to give a great vote of confidence, not only to the Republican President and the Republican Secretary of State, but also to the Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as well.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was the wish of the President that the resolution be tabled in committee. That fact was brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have had conversations with the President on an occasion or two, but I was not informed by the President that he desired to have the resolution tabled in the committee. I am glad to know that the Senator from Indiana feels that he can make that statement.

But I wish to remind the Senator, and recall to his vivid memory, a lecture which the Senator from Texas received one evening on the floor from the very able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], when I asked him if the President felt the tax bill ought to pass.

In his own inimitable way, the Senator from Colorado left his desk, marched down the aisle, and said, "Thank God, I do not have to run to a telephone booth and call the White House to find out what the procedure in the Senate should be."

I simply feed those words of the Senator from Colorado back into the teeth of the Senator from Indiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the purpose of the record, and lest there be any misunderstanding, the minority leader reported to the committee on yesterday that he had discussed with the President the various alternatives which were under consideration by the committee. I gave the President what I felt were cogent reasons for handling the situation in a way which I though would cause the least damage to the country. I think I have already said that I happened to differ with the Senator from Indiana merely in the approach. I told both the Acting Secretary of State and the President that I intended to make a motion to table. My understanding was that it was their judgment that if it was the decision of the committee to proceed in that way, that would be entirely satisfactory to them. That is what I reported to the committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from California so stated before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to be placed in the position of saying that the President, the Secretary of State, and the Acting Secretary of State did not make their views known on the proper method of procedure in voting in the Senate committee. I think I violate no confidence when I say that at 12:15 or 12:20 yesterday afternoon, after having attempted to reach the Acting Secretary of State for a considerable period of time on a very important matter, and after having been informed that he had an appointment that afternoon, and would be unable to appear before the committee on what I considered to be a vitally important matter, I insisted on talking to the Acting Secretary of State, and did so.

I was informed that the resolution was opposed by not only the Acting Secretary of State, but also by all the other assistant secretaries of State—Mr. Henderson, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Morton, and others.

I did not discuss with them the question of tabling the resolution, because no one had raised the question at that point. But I felt very much as the Senator from Colorado felt on another occasion.

At 12:20 p. m. yesterday I outlined my views to the President, as did the minority leader, evidently.

I said to the President, "The resolution is pending. Charges have been made that it will be buried; that it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations"—of which the senior Senator from Indiana is a member—"and will stay there. I think that would be a mistake. Therefore, I have asked the minority leader to join with me, and he has joined with me, in having a very prompt hearing.

"I am going back to the Hill, and we are going to have that hearing. I hope it may be possible to get the record of the hearings and the report printed promptly, because the junior Senator from Wisconsin wants action before Thursday. I feel that I am morally bound and that the spirit of my assurance is to get that action."

That was my statement to the President. If the Senator from Indiana will cooperate we will get that action.

The President did not presume to say to me, "Senator, I think it would be a bad mistake if you moved adversely or favorably, or made a motion to table," because while the President is a man of great background and experience and long service in the Government, actually none of that experience, as far as I know, was in a legislative body, and certainly not in the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. The majority leader did exactly what he just stated. I think he did an excellent job in bringing the resolution to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee held public hearings. It listened to all witnesses who cared to be heard. I remember the chairman of the committee asked in public, before the representatives of the press, "Does anybody else wish to be heard?" Then the committee went into executive session. It was the vote of every member of the committee that the resolution should be defeated.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I notice in the report that the distinguished Senator from Indiana himself voted to report the resolution to the Senate adversely.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Now he is "squawking" because the resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator knows that in the committee the minority leader made a motion to table the resolution. He knows the vote was 8 to 7 against tabling. He likewise knows the senior Senator from Indiana was opposed to the resolution, because he had said so publicly. He likewise knew no Senator would vote to report the resolution adversely unless he was against it. The Senator is simply being technical.

Mr. LANGER. The fact is that the distinguished Senator from Indiana himself voted to report the resolution to the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. All who were present so voted.

Mr. LANGER. Oh, no; I voted the other way. I was not there on the first vote.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator was not there.

Mr. LANGER. When it was all over, I voted against reporting the resolution adversely.

Mr. CAPEHART. The fact of the matter is the Senator from North Dakota was not present when the vote was taken. He did not vote one way or the other. Through the goodness of the Senator from Indiana, he was able to record his vote, because I made a motion, as the able chairman knows, that the Senator from North Dakota be permitted to record his vote at a later date. I am sure the Senator appreciates that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ERVIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to clear up what may be a misunderstanding in my own recollection of the matter. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Indiana to say the President of the United States wanted the resolution tabled?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I said the minority leader, who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, said the President would like to see the resolution tabled, or he used some such words. There is not a member of the committee who does not remember hearing that.

Mr. MORSE. I listened to the Senator from California, and I thought the language used by the Senator from California did not go nearly so far as did the language used by the Senator from Indiana. The Senator from California proceeded to report what he had said to the President of the United States, but I do not think that report is subject to the interpretation that the President of the United States wanted to have the resolution tabled or urged that that be done. I do not think the statement of the Senator from California—at least, what was said in my hearing—implied that the President of the United States rendered a judgment as to the procedure he would prefer to have the committee follow.

Mr. CAPEHART. The President of the United States is opposed to the resolution. The substance of the remarks of the able Senator from California was that the President would like to see the resolution tabled, or handled as quickly as possible, and gotten rid of. That was my position yesterday. It is my position today.

As I said a moment ago, the matter was handled properly by the majority leader. The resolution was referred to the committee. The committee held public hearings. The committee went into executive sessions. The committee was opposed to the resolution. All members were opposed to the resolution.

I have made these remarks only because I wish the RECORD to show that I do not think there should be any breakdown in our committee system, or any breakdown in the customs or the rules of the Senate, in order to take advantage of someone. That is my point.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Indiana will permit me to say so, the Senator from California can speak for himself, but I do not think the Senator from California made a statement on the record which would be subject to the interpretation that the President passed judgment on the procedure which should be followed by the committee in handling the resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not intend to say he did. I cannot read the President's mind. My best judgment is that the President's thoughts were, "Get rid of it as quickly as possible." That is what we should have done yesterday afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator left me with the impression that the President expressed his judgment on the procedure which should be followed.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was referring only to what was said in the committee, which should have been reported.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes on the resolution in order to express my views concerning it. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I participated in the meeting of yesterday and voted to table the resolution because I thought that was, in the long run, the most effective and the least harmful method which presented itself to us of handling it.

I stated in committee that I was opposed to the resolution because I thought it was not timely, because, as I said, coming at this late date, on the eve of the exploratory conference at San Francisco, the resolution could do nothing but harm if it were adopted.

After the motion to table was rejected by a vote of 8 to 7 the vote came on reporting the resolution to the Senate adversely. I had no other course than to vote to report the resolution adversely, because that is the way I felt about the resolution, having been on the side that was defeated on the motion to table it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I gather that the Senator felt yesterday that the resolution as worded would tie the President's hands too much. I have an amendment which I think meets the objections which the Senator had in mind. I wonder if he is aware of the terms of the amendment I have offered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A copy of it has just been handed to me. I have not read it. I have not had a chance to study it. I shall look at it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator that, to my mind, this is one of the most important actions this body will take for a long time. I know the resolution is slated for defeat because, knowing the history of the Democrat Party for the past 20 years, I know my friends on the Democrat side of the aisle will vote against anything other than appeasement and surrender. I know there will be a solid Democrat vote against the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. So I address my remarks principally to the Republicans. I should like to know if the Senator from Iowa does not feel that the resolution merely confirms what Under Secretary of State Hoover said the President favors. He said he felt the President and the Secretary of State were in complete sympathy with the ultimate objective of Senate Resolution 116. This resolution merely provides that the Senate shall express itself as being also in favor of the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116.

Before the Senator answers the question, I should like to call attention to the Republican platform upon which we were elected, and which stated that the President and the Congress would make clear how the United States felt about the liberation of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. I wonder if the Senator will find in the amended resolution anything obnoxious to that provision of the Republican platform.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall discuss that in a moment. I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment to the resolution, especially the "whereases," which I wish to mention.

But, Mr. President, for fear that silence on my part might be interpreted as assent, I wish to say that I do not agree with the junior Senator from Wisconsin that, by and large, the Democratic Members of this body are in favor of appeasement in respect to communism. I do not desire to quarrel with the Senator from Wisconsin and I do not suppose he meant that what he said should be interpreted in quite the way it sounded. But I wish to say that I have the greatest confidence in and respect for my Democratic colleagues, and I would be the last to say that any Democratic Member of the Senate is an appeaser, insofar as communism is concerned. On occasion I disagree with my Democratic colleagues on matters of policy, but I believe the differences of opinion are honest ones.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said that over the past 20 years the Democratic Party has been a party of appeasement; and I think the Democratic Senators will go straight

down the line, again, in opposing adoption of the resolution. That is a prediction which will be proven either true or false before the afternoon is over.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not intend to become involved in a discussion of political philosophy this afternoon. I believe the Democratic Members of the Senate are perfectly capable of presenting their own views, so I shall neither attack nor defend their position, because of their own well-known ability to speak for themselves.

Mr. President, if I have to vote on the resolution, I expect to vote against it; but I do not wish to be accused of being an appeaser of communism; I do not wish to be understood as taking any such position.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was a little surprised at what the Senator from Iowa said. First, he said he had not read the amended resolution. Now he says he will vote against it. How can the Senator from Iowa decide that he will vote against it before he reads it? Will he please read it before he announces his position?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall conduct my affairs in my own way, let me say for the information of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I shall read the amendment in my own time; and I shall make up my own mind after I have read the amendment and after I know what is before the Senate.

I am speaking of the resolution which was submitted to the Senate, and was acted upon by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; that is what I wish to discuss at the moment.

I understand that the resolution is one of emotion. By that, I mean it goes deeply into the political philosophies of the world—in particular, of the Iron Curtain countries—and of communism, and it includes our attitude toward free institutions. The resolution is an important one; but I feel that it proposes a rather unusual procedure and one which I do not believe will serve the best interests of the country.

I desire to state my reasons for making that statement. First of all, let me say that I do not believe any Member of the Senate disagrees with the objectives generally outlined in the resolution. In other words, all of us would like to see freedom obtained for the captive countries. We wish to see the present satellite countries attain the right of self-determination. We wish to see communism and the slavery it imposes eliminated from the world. We are consistent in that view, a view which I believe is unanimously entertained by the Senate. I have no idea that any Member of the Senate deviates from it or fails to endorse the ambitions of captive countries for freedom.

But, Mr. President, here is the situation in which we find ourselves: An exploratory series of conversations is either being held at the present time or will be begun tomorrow. Those exploratory conversations are for the purpose of outlining an area within which discussions can be held next month at Geneva.

I am frank to say, as I said yesterday in the Foreign Relations Committee, that if a resolution of this kind—perhaps not one in the same words, but a resolution expressing the sentiment or the sense of the Senate on this subject or on any other important subject which claims the attention of the country—had been submitted some months ago, before we were right up "against the gun," if you please, because of the imminence of a great international conference, I would have been perfectly willing at that time, before we were in a position in which we could be embarrassed, to have the Senate express its sentiments concerning political or international philosophy.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is not the Senator from Iowa aware of the fact that the resolution could not have been presented months ago because, to begin with, it was unthinkable that such a conference would be held. The President said it would not be. Second, after the President decided that the conference could proceed, I am sure the Senator from Iowa will agree that it was unthinkable that we would consent not to discuss the satellite nations. It was only within the last week that those in the Kremlin said they would not discuss the satellite nations—in other words, anything which might benefit the free world. Therefore, it was impossible for me to present the resolution before the last 3 or 4 days; and I presented it as quickly as possible after that announcement by the Kremlin, and after the statement by Secretary Dulles.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand the reasoning of the Senator from Wisconsin on that score. If one accepts the premises of the Senator from Wisconsin, his reasoning has considerable merit to it. I do not necessarily accept all the premises upon which he bases his reasoning.

But, Mr. President, be that as it may, the resolution has been submitted. I feel that nothing would be accomplished if it were adopted by the Senate. Worthy as the sentiment may be, I feel that the resolution would do nothing but completely hamper, and probably throw a complete roadblock in the path of, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, insofar as the latitude and the freedom of their ability to negotiate and discuss at the meeting or meetings are concerned.

Furthermore, we have the assurance of the Secretary of State that we can discuss, and that we are not precluded from discussing, and that we have the right to discuss, the matter of the Iron Curtain countries and their satellites and their freedom.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield again to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator from Iowa now discussing the resolution which he considered in the committee yesterday, or is he now discussing the amended resolution?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am discussing the inadvisability of adopting at this time a resolution which would tend to circumscribe a great area of the negotiating opportunities or privileges or competence, for instance, of the President and the Secretary of State. In a moment I shall discuss the details, and then I shall be willing to try to discuss the amendment the Senator from Wisconsin proposes to offer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me suggest to the Senator from Iowa that the Under Secretary of State said the President was "in complete sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116."

I merely wish the Senate to go on record now as also being in sympathy with the objective of freeing the satellite nations, and to have the Senate go on record as agreeing with the President.

In what way shall we circumscribe the President's activities or tie his hands, if we go on record by adopting the resolution at this time, and if we thus show how the Senate feels in regard to this all-important subject?

If the Senate goes on record now as not being in sympathy with the objective of Senate Resolution 116, the Senate will be telling the satellite nations that it does not favor their ultimate freedom.

Will the Senator from Iowa please confine himself to the measure which will be before the Senate, namely, not the resolution which was before the Foreign Relations Committee on yesterday, but the amendment? I changed the resolution in order to try to meet the objections of the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from California, and other Senators. So we shall be wasting our time if we discuss the resolution which was considered yesterday by the committee because that measure will not be before the Senate for vote today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, at this time my objections go to the mechanical principle involved at this moment rather than to verbiage.

On yesterday I voted and did whatever else I could in the Foreign Relations Committee to try to get the committee—which was unanimously opposed to adoption of the resolution, at least at this time—to end the controversy right there and to table the resolution.

That would have been effective action and it would have been decisive. The unanimous vote of the Foreign Relations Committee to table the resolution in the committee would have been committee action in its ordinary and customary province and it would have ended the controversy.

I had certain reasons for my position. One might well ask, if I am opposed to the resolution, why I do not wish to vote "nay" on the resolution if it comes to a vote. I shall vote "nay" if I must vote on the resolution, but I would rather not. I think it would be ill-advised to bring it to a vote. I shall state my reasons.

I refer, first, to the "whereas" clauses of the resolution. I realize that there has been a modification and that the "whereas" clauses have been deleted, but I am giving my reasons for my vote of

yesterday. The first "whereas" clause reads as follows:

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress and more particularly the Senate, has concurrent responsibility with the executive branch for the formulation of the international policies of the United States.

I do not agree with that "whereas" in full. I think we have responsibilities in the Senate in connection with many phases of foreign policy, but I could not support that "whereas" clause as thus stated.

The second "whereas" clause contained in the resolution of yesterday reads as follows:

Whereas the safety, peace, and independence of the United States are seriously threatened by the aggressive world Communist movement under the leadership of the Soviet Union.

I agree with that; but let me suggest that an overwhelming "nay" vote on this resolution by the Senate of the United States, with those words in the resolution, would put a propaganda weapon in the hands of every Communist country in the world. They would say, "Look at the great Senate of the United States. It votes 'nay' and denies that the safety, peace, and independence of the United States are seriously threatened by the aggressive world Communist movement under the leadership of the Soviet Union."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The statement of the distinguished Senator from Iowa answers the question as to the dangers with which we are faced propagandawise. The Russians could make use of this resolution in trying to prove that we are not honest, and that we are not endeavoring to reestablish the sovereignty of the satellite nations. The Senator is touching upon the question in a most important manner. I see all the dangers involved, and I am most unhappy that such a resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator. I raised that very question yesterday in the Foreign Relations Committee with regard to these provisions. I expect to place my reasons in the RECORD, to explain my position today.

The third "whereas" clause reads as follows:

Whereas the United States is pledged to seek the freedom of the millions of people who have already been enslaved by the world Communist movement.

That "whereas" clause was in the resolution yesterday. A "nay" vote on the resolution on the floor of the Senate would place a propaganda weapon in the hands of every Communist nation and satellite. They would say, "The Senate of the United States voted 'nay' on the statement, 'Whereas the United States is pledged to seek the freedom of the millions of people who have already been enslaved by the world Communist movement'."

The fourth "whereas" clause reads as follows:

Whereas the safety, peace, and independence of the United States can never be permanently secured, nor the goal of the United States to obtain the freedom of oppressed peoples realized, so long as certain areas of the world remain under Communist control; namely, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, Eastern Germany, Northern Korea, Northern Indochina, China, and the Soviet Union.

That is an affirmative declaration that the safety and peace of the world cannot be assured so long as certain areas of the world remain under Communist control. That declaration would be negated by a vote of "nay" in the Senate. If the great Senate of the United States votes "nay" overwhelmingly on that declaration, what a propaganda weapon will be placed in the hands of the most astute propaganda users the world has ever seen.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me conclude with the "whereas" clauses.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have a point to make in that connection. I think the Senator from Iowa has made a very good point. He makes the point very well, and I agree with everything he has said about the propaganda weapon which would be placed in the hands of Communists if the Senate should vote "nay" on this resolution. I know what will happen today. I know that there will be a "nay" vote. I know that there will be a solid Democrat vote. I know that, following the leadership of the minority leader, the administration supporters will vote "nay." Therefore we shall be giving the Communists a great propaganda weapon. We shall be discouraging the peoples of the satellite countries. They will think we have abandoned them because of the vote in the Senate. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have the floor. I did not yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought the Senator from Iowa had yielded.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yielded for a question. I did not yield for the transaction of business.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Iowa yield so that I may make a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that, inasmuch as the Senator from Iowa did not yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator from Wisconsin to make a unanimous-consent request, such unanimous-consent request is out of order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With all due respect, I should be glad to yield, except that I wish, in another 7 or 10 minutes, to make my position clear as to what I think the action of the Senate should be. I shall then yield the floor, or yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for the purpose for which he asks me to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wholeheartedly agree with what the Senator says. If we vote "nay" we shall be giving the Communists a powerful propaganda weapon. There is no reason why we should vote "nay." We should have "guts" enough to stand up and vote "yea." But I know what is going on today. I know that there will be a solid vote on the other side of the aisle. The administration supporters on this side of the aisle will vote "nay." There is no question about that. Such a vote could be disastrous to the morale of the underground in the occupied countries. That is the reason why I asked the Senator from Iowa to yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I desire to round out my statement for the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. I wish to make it crystal clear that I am not motivated to follow either the minority leader or the administration. My mind was made up on this question when the resolution was first submitted. I determined to vote "nay." I would have voted "nay" that night. I would vote "nay" today. My conscience dictates a vote of "nay" any time an attempt is made to tie the hands of the President and the Secretary of State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to confirm what the Senator from Minnesota said the other night when he was acting as minority leader.

I should like to observe, in passing, that if the prediction of the Senator from Wisconsin is correct, and if there is a substantially unanimous vote "nay" today, I know of no reason why a unanimous "nay" vote should be interpreted as being disastrous to the country, particularly when such unanimous vote expresses confidence in the constitutional authorities of the country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall come to that point in just a moment.

I believe that if the resolution, even as modified by the Senator from Wisconsin earlier in the day, should come to a vote, I would be bound to vote against the resolution, as modified, or any other resolution of this kind at this stage in the negotiation proceedings. I am bound to vote "nay," because I think the resolution should not be approved.

However, the reason I think it should not be approved will never get behind the Iron Curtain. None of the explanations made on the floor of the Senate and appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, including high-sounding, sincere, and complimentary terms which have been used about protecting the President of the United States and upholding his hand, the expressions in condemnation of Soviet slavery, and so forth, will ever get behind the Iron Curtain—not for one second.

The only thing that will get behind the Iron Curtain is the modified resolution which now states:

Whereas the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., on June 21, 1955, informed the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as follows: "I feel certain that the President and the Secretary of State are in complete sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate is also in sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objectives of Senate Resolution 116.

That will get behind the Iron Curtain. The record vote of 85 to 1 or to 2, or 85 to 0, or whatever the vote may be, will get behind the Iron Curtain, and the propaganda mills will start grinding out: "This is what the real sentiment of the Senate of the United States is."

The people behind the Iron Curtain will never hear the eloquent words of the distinguished Senator from Texas or of the distinguished Senator from California, or of the other Members of the Senate who said, "I am against this resolution because it is procedurally wrong."

That will never get behind the Iron Curtain. A vote "nay" against the verbiage of the resolution will be a propaganda weapon, as I said a moment ago, and will be used by the greatest and most skilled propagandists the world has ever known.

That is why I voted yesterday, and I urged the Committee on Foreign Relations to vote, to table the resolution, so that there would not be a negative vote on the humanitarian principles announced in the resolution. That is why I hoped the committee would table it.

That is why I hope—although I have no intention at this moment to make a motion to table the resolution—the leadership in the Senate, if we must come to a final vote on the resolution, will support a motion to table it and thus keep a vote of "nay" from being used by the propaganda agencies of the Communist powers.

I think that is fundamental. If we fail to table the resolution—if we must act on the resolution at all—and if the Senate must vote, when most of us are impelled to vote "nay" on a procedural matter, we will be doing a disservice to the whole psychology of freedom in the places in the world where today the Communist propaganda is most effective. That is about all I wanted to say. I have practically concluded my remarks.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall yield in a moment. After we were defeated in the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday on a motion to solve the problem by settling it in committee—and I am not impressed by the argument that if we vote "nay" it will end the matter—someone pointed out that the Senator from Wisconsin could attach the resolution to every piece of legislation that comes before the Senate from now until adjournment day.

If we had voted to table the resolution in committee yesterday, and if thereafter a Senator had made a motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations and to bring the resolution to the floor of the Senate, the matter could have been handled without debate by a motion being made on the floor of the Senate to table the motion to discharge the Committee, and the issue could have been met in that way.

However, the point I tried to get across yesterday, as did some other Senators, was that if we tabled the resolution in the Committee on Foreign Relations, we would not be committing the Senate to a misunderstood vote. I feel very deeply about it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will say that it will not be a misunderstood vote. On the contrary, it will be understood. The resolution is very clear. I quote it:

Whereas the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., on June 21, 1955, informed the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as follows: "I feel certain that the President and the Secretary of State are in complete sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate is also in sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116.

The Senator from Iowa says he will vote "no" because of the procedure involved. I wonder what procedure he has in mind. When he ran for reelection he ran on the platform which had as one of its planks:

It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples.

The Senator from Iowa ran on that platform. He has not repudiated it. Now he says he objects to the procedure. The procedure here is in complete line with all the rules of the Senate. The resolution was submitted. It was referred to the committee. It was adversely reported by the committee. I have modified the resolution to try to meet the objections of the committee. I wonder what the Senator from Iowa has in mind when he says he will vote "nay" because of procedure.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have had every assurance as to how the President feels and as to how the Secretary of State feels. We know in general what their attitudes are. They feel just as keenly on this matter as does the Senate. I said at the outset—I do not know whether the Senator from Wisconsin was present at the time—that I thought it was largely the untimeliness of the resolution which caused concern. I said if prior to the calling of the conference the issue had been discussed and the Senate had desired to express itself as to its attitude, it would have been proper. We have voted before on resolutions expressing the sense of the Senate in advance of some happening in the future involving questions of policy. There is ample precedent for it. We have a right to do it. I do not deny that we have the right to do it. But at this moment, I feel we are right in the middle of the stream, so to speak. The program has already been launched. The negotiations are underway. People from all over the world are in San Francisco in connection with this program. I feel that any attempted direction at this time by the Senate would be a disservice in that it would hamper the negotiating ability and limit the latitude of the President and the Secretary of State.

I am about to keep my word to the Senator from Wisconsin. I said a moment ago that I had hoped this resolution would be tabled in the Committee on Foreign Relations. If it proceeds to a vote in the Senate, I hope very earnestly that the leadership will agree that the proper procedure—and it would be a procedure under which every Member of the Senate could express himself, and by a record vote, too—will be to take the route of tabling this measure. Every Member of the Senate could vote on it and he could express himself. His vote would not be misunderstood as a vote against the principles for which we generally stand and of which we approve. That is the procedure I had hoped we would take, and I still hope we will take it. It is one we could take in order to express ourselves on the procedural aspect, and it would not give to the Kremlin propaganda documents to be waved throughout the satellite countries.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. I said to the Senator from Wisconsin a moment ago that when I finished my feeble attempt to explain my position I would then be glad to yield to him for the purpose of having him ask unanimous consent to withdraw his resolution, as he mentioned a moment ago he desires to do, if he still desires to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall ask the Senator from Iowa to yield for that purpose in a moment. First I should like to ask the Senator a question. He said the resolution expresses sentiments which most of the Members of the Senate approve. I should like to know what there is in the resolution to which the Senator objects. What part of the resolution is objectionable?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is the procedure.

Mr. McCARTHY. In the resolution we would say that we are in sympathy with freeing the satellite nations. If we are not in sympathy with that, we should vote "nay." If we are in sympathy with freeing them, we should vote "yea." We are in no way tying the President's hands. We are merely telling him how the Senate feels. Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., said that the President was in sympathy with the humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116. Why is this resolution so objectionable to the Senator from Iowa? The Senator says

it was untimely. I say to the Senator that I could not have submitted the resolution before the Big Four Conference was decided on, and it would not have been timely to have submitted it until after the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, had made his statement about the satellite countries and the Kremlin leaders had made their reply.

What the resolution seeks to do is what the Republicans in their platform said they would do. We made a solemn contract with the American people. We said we would make it clear how Congress felt—not how the President felt, but how Congress felt—about these international problems. What is there in this resolution that is objectionable? What is there in it against which the Senator feels he must vote?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We would be injecting ourselves into one phase of the negotiations, when we have the positive assurance of the State Department that these very matters can be and, no doubt, will be taken up in the discussion.

Mr. McCARTHY. What will a "nay" vote do to the satellite nations?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It will give them a propaganda weapon which I should not like to see them have. If I have the floor, and the Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to withdraw his resolution, I anticipate there is a fair chance his unanimous-consent request will be granted and there will be no vote on the resolution. I hope there will be no vote on it.

I think the question has been sufficiently aired. The sentiments of Senators on both sides of the aisle have been adequately expressed. I think the intense interest in this subject will be very well impressed upon the Secretary of State, if it has not been already impressed upon him by his own experience, as I have no doubt it has been. The Senator from Wisconsin may have done a service to the country by bringing it to the attention of the country. If we have to vote, I would rather vote on the question of tabling the resolution. But I earnestly hope the Senator from Wisconsin may see fit to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have been impressed by some of the remarks made by the Senator from Iowa, namely, his argument that a "nay" vote will supply a great propaganda weapon to the Communists. It will also dampen the spirit of the underground in the satellite nations.

I know there will be a "nay" vote, because I know the Democrats will vote as a party en bloc in line with 20 years of past history. I know that under the leadership of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a great many Republicans will vote against the resolution—but without any reason for so voting, as all of them agree that the resolution expresses the sentiments of the Senate. Yet, for some unknown reason, they will vote against it. We will be saying that the United States Senate does not have any sympathy for the underground in the satellite nations, and does not feel those nations should be free.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in my book——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Iowa had yielded the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have a little more to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin now has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I will yield for whatever remarks the Senator from Iowa wishes to make.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has rendered a very valuable service to the Communist Party. He knows that the Democrats are going to vote en bloc against the resolution. He knows there will be sufficient Republican votes to defeat it. He knows what a propaganda weapon it will give the Communists. The Senator from Iowa has explained this adequately. He knows what damage will be done to enslaved peoples. The Senator from Arkansas knows I have made the request to withdraw the resolution in order to avoid the propaganda damage. Nevertheless, for political reasons, he rises and objects. He has rendered a real service to the Communist Party today, and a real disservice to the people of the satellite nations.

He sits there and laughs, Mr. President. It is no laughing matter. He can grin and smirk, but the enslaved peoples will not grin and smirk about it when they are advised of what the Senator has done. I repeat, he has done a great service to the Communist cause.

Mr. President, in my book, a campaign promise is a solemn contract with the American people. I am not addressing myself now to the Democrat Members of this body, because they made no such campaign promise. In fact, the American people knew they stood for appeasement. They knew that for 20 years the Democrats whined and whimpered when they touched the red hot stove of Communist aggression. I am addressing the Republicans in this body and in the Nation. I campaigned from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from New Orleans to St. Paul, and I quoted this platform pledge. I asked Democrats throughout the Nation to vote for us, promising them that the days of appeasement were ended, that there was a new day really dawning.

Here is the part of the platform which I should like to quote for the benefit of my Republican colleagues in the Senate, especially the Republican leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]:

> It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples.

We did not say "on the authority of the President only"; we said, "on the highest authority of the President and the Congress."

But today the Senate says, "Oh, no; we cannot do that. We would be interfering with the President if we made clear what our position is."

Let me quote further from our platform. Up until this time there has never been a resolution before the Senate through which we could show we were living up to that platform pledge. Today we have the opportunity, but we are turning it down.

I read further:

> We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. That program will give the Voice of America a real function. It will mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of "containment" which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction.

We placed that particular section in the platform because we felt the Democrats had been following a contrarule up to that time, and we said we would make clear how the Congress felt about it. But now I hear Senators who campaigned upon that solemn contract with the American people saying on the floor of the Senate, "We cannot tell the President how we feel; we might be interfering with the President and State Department."

Mr. President, I was shocked by one statement made by the majority leader. He said that there is only one man who can speak for the country. He is wrong. This is not a dictatorship. The Senate also speaks for this country. There are 96 Members here who can speak for this country.

I was intrigued by the speech of the Senator from California. His whole speech was to the effect that the President felt as I do. He read from the President's speeches and had excerpts from them printed in the RECORD, proving that the President felt the way I do, as expressed in this resolution.

Then, for some unknown reason—the Senator from California again forgets the campaign pledge—he says we cannot let the country, we cannot let the world, know how the Senate feels.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be read; and I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is the amendment being offered or merely read?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is being offered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof:

> That the Senate is also in sympathy with the ultimate humanitarian objectives of Senate Resolution 116, and the Senate hopes that the ultimate humanitarian objective of Senate Resolution 116, namely, securing the

freedom of the Communist-controlled satellites enumerated therein, will be pursued by the President at the forthcoming Geneva meeting between the heads of state.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARTHY. With the understanding that I do not lose the floor——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the Senator had concluded. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Chair rule that the amendment is in order?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor, for the purpose of a quorum call? I thought that inasmuch as an entirely different approach, at least, is being presented, there should be a quorum call now.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield with that understanding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the present situation, I understand the amendment is merely pending at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been offered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With the understanding that the junior Senator from Wisconsin will not lose his right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the understanding proposed by the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Fulbright	McCarthy
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Barkley	Green	McNamara
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bender	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Hruska	Neuberger
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bush	Jackson	Pastore
Butler	Jenner	Payne
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Carlson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Scott
Chavez	Kilgore	Smathers
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the United Nations anniversary celebration in San Francisco as representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. On the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays. Senators should not be worried about standing up and being counted on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate has just finished a quorum call which developed a quorum. Does the asking for and the refusal of the yeas and nays constitute business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, it does. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope Senators will at least give me the yeas and nays on this amendment. In my book, it is extremely important, and there is no reason why any Senator should be reluctant to stand up and be counted on this amendment. It is an amendment to my resolution.

I again ask for the yeas and nays, and I sincerely hope Senators will give me enough seconds.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in conclusion I may say I am not surprised at the position taken by my Democrat colleagues. I expected that from them. I did not expect it from the Republican side of the aisle, however.

I may say that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], after consultation with the majority leader, knew that they had a solid Democrat vote against the resolution. That is the reason he objected to the withdrawal. He knew, or should know—I assume he has enough intelligence to know what he was doing—that a vote by the Senate against the resolution, which merely says we are in favor of freeing the satellite nations—will aid the Communist cause tremendously for the reasons set forth by the Senator from Iowa. It will hurt the cause of the satellite nations, which had hoped we would stand behind them.

I feel that nothing can be gained by further discussion of the resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin some questions, and I hope he will not in any way become excited or angry about them, because, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, on the censure resolution which was proposed against him, I was for him, because I thought it was wrong.

On this occasion the Senator has accused Republican Members of the Senate and the minority leader of failing to live up to the platform of the Republican Party. My questions is wherein have President Eisenhower, the Secretary of State, or the Republican Congress at any time failed to live up to their obligations? In what respect have they appeased or done something which would give any comfort whatsoever to the Communists? Will the Senator name some of the cases?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to answer the question. The Senator is doing that.

Mr. CAPEHART. Name them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am answering the question. The Senator is doing it today when he refuses to support a resolution that merely says we are in favor of freeing the satellite nations. The platform upon which the Senator ran says that it will be made clear on the highest authority of the President and the Congress that we seek the freedom of the captive peoples. We had a reason for putting that in our platform. It was because we felt the Democrats had not been doing it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Senator, let me talk a minute. It is the President of the United States and the Secretary of State who will attend the conference at Geneva, not the Senator or I. The Acting Secretary of State said:

> In the preliminary conversations that have already taken place regarding arrangements for the conference, it has been agreed that each of the participants would be free to take up any subject which it believed to be a contributory cause of world tensions. The purpose of such an agreement was to eliminate possible arguments on the fixing of a rigid agenda.

Will the Senator answer my question? I ask him to name instances in which Members of this body on the Republican side, the President, or the Vice President, have in any way appeased or have given any comfort whatsoever to the Communists? We are entitled to an answer to that question, because the accusations of the Senator from Wisconsin today have been general with regard to voting against the resolution. The resolution which was before the Senate today when we met was the resolution which the committee acted on last night, which was different from the one now before the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. But the amended resolution is now before the Senate, and the Senator is urging the Senate to vote against it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Name one instance——

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator be kind enough to let me finish?

Mr. CAPEHART. Wherein the President of the United States or the Congress have given comfort to the Communists?

Mr. McCARTHY. Senator, forgetting what is being done today, the Korean surrender was appeasement. Giving up the Tachen Islands was appeasement. Giving up northern Indochina was appeasement. But a further example of appeasement is what the Senate is encouraging today. The Senate has before it a resolution which simply says that the President has said he is in sympathy with the objectives of Senate Resolution 116, namely, freeing the satellite nations and that the Senate is, too. And we say we hope the President will pursue that objective at Geneva. When the Senator urges the Senate tc vote against it, he is violating the Republican campaign pledges.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought the Under Secretary of State said the President was in sympathy with the objective of the resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. The Senator is urging the Senate to vote against it, when the President has said he is in sympathy with its objective.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have not talked on the subject at all. The resolution which was before the committee last night is entirely different from the one now before the Senate. Why did the Senator from Wisconsin not amend the resolution yesterday?

Mr. McCARTHY. I made the changes to try to meet the objections of Senators like the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; the Senator did not.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do not tell me I did not. I am telling the Senator why I changed the resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why did the Senator——

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator listen to me and be quiet for a minute?

Mr. CAPEHART. All the Senator did was to take what Under Secretary of State Hoover said yesterday and make it a part of the resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator wait while I answer his question?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Please try to be quiet while I answer.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not like to have the Senator accuse me and other Republican Senators.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator now be quiet?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator said he was not going to become excited.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The regular order will be followed.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator asked why I changed the resolution. I changed it for this reason: Yesterday I appeared before the committee of which the Senator is a member and I heard the objections made to my resolution. It was said we were tying the President's hands.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not say that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I meant the committee. The committee argued that my resolution would tie the President's hands before the negotiators met in Geneva. At that time I decided the resolution would have no chance of passing in the face of the objection that it would tie the President's hands. Therefore, I tried to meet the objections of the committee and I took the language of the Under Secretary of State, Herbert Hoover, Jr. I said in view of the fact that the President said he was in sympathy with the objectives of the resolution, therefore the Senate should also go on record as being in sympathy with the resolution, and express its hope that the President will pursue those objectives at Geneva. Now the Senator is saying he will vote against it.

Mr. CAPEHART. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought the Senator was.

Mr. CAPEHART. I rose to ask the Senator a question. The Senator had said that Republicans, the President, and the Secretary of State were Communist appeasers.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said they were violating their campaign pledges.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are some of us who feel that our record of fighting Communists is as good as the record of any other man. There are some of us who feel the Senator from Wisconsin is not always right; that he is sometimes wrong. There are some of us who have the courage to be with the Senator from Wisconsin when we think he is right, and who will vote against him when we think he is wrong. In this instance I think the Senator from Wisconsin is wrong. Personally I have no particular knowledge of any facts which would show that the President or the Secretary of State have in any way appeased Communists. I can say that the Korean Treaty was a matter of judgment, as was the Indochina Treaty; but fortunately or unfortunately—I think fortunately—the President of the United States and the Secretary of State handle these matters with the advice and consent of the Senate. I am not here to defend or carp about anybody, but I do not like the blanket indictment the Senator has made against every Republican, and particularly the blanket indictment he has made against the minority leader. Just give us the facts.

Mr. McCARTHY. When Republican Senators vote that they are not in favor of freeing the satellite nations, that is a clear-cut violation of their campaign pledges. That is the question on which the vote will come. The Under Secretary of State said the President is in sympathy with that goal.

I have asked the Senate to go on record on this matter, so the President will know that the Senate also is in favor of freeing the satellite nations. That is all the resolution calls for; it has now been watered down much more than I should like. A vote of "nay" on the resolution will be interpreted to mean that a Senator who so votes is voting against the idea of freeing the satellite nations, and that will be notice to the Communists and to the satellite nations that Members of the United States Senate are not in favor of freeing the satellite nations. I think such a vote would be disastrous. I cannot conceive that any Republican Senator would vote "nay" on that question, although I know that many of them will. For that reason I asked to be allowed to withdraw the resolution—to prevent a propaganda disaster. The Senator from Arkansas objected.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin is referring to the sentiments expressed for the President and for the Secretary of State by the Undersecretary of State. The President and the Secretary of State have said they are in favor of freeing the satellite nations; and they are in favor of that, and everyone knows it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then why does not the Senator from Indiana vote for it?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have not had a chance to do so. But the Senator from Wisconsin is raising a general indictment against the minority leader and all other Republican Members of the Senate. The Senator from Wisconsin should not do so. He should not try to indict those of us who in the past have voted to uphold his hand. He should not attempt to beat out our brains. I, myself, am a fairly good fighter, and I do not like to have my brains beaten out. This may be the first time for that to happen, but I do not like to have it done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say in all candor that all Republican Senators joined in the Republican Party's campaign pledge to aid the satellite nations. Any Republican Senator who votes "nay" on the question of agreeing to this resolution will be violating that campaign pledge. It is entirely possible that some Republican Senators did not agree to that part of the Republican Party's campaign platform, but I have not heard any Republican Senator say he did not agree to it. That part of the Republican Party's platform was included in it after long thought. In fact, I believe that the Senator from Indiana himself was a member of the Republican platform committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I was not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sorry. I thought the Senator from Indiana was a member of the platform committee.

Mr. President, the campaign platform constitutes a solemn pledge. Some Republican Senators will say, today, "We do not favor freeing the satellite nations"; and that is the subject on which the vote will be taken.

Mr. CAPEHART. But I know of no action on the part of the President or the Secretary of State or the Congress which would indicate that they are not 100 percent in favor of freeing the satellite nations.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin is simply talking about words. Let us consider the record of the President and the Secretary of State, insofar as this

matter is concerned, instead of simply making a blanket indictment.

When I am told that it was agreed at San Francisco that our representatives could take up any subject they might wish to take up at the conference—which includes what the Senator from Wisconsin suggests in his resolution—then, personally, I can see no necessity for the resolution. I see no necessity for it.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its full support of any and all efforts of the President, at any meeting or conference with other nations, to state the deep interest of the American people in the present and future status of the nations of Eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the amendment which has just been read, offered as an amendment to the resolution which is the subject of the debate; or is the amendment offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin to the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it is an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct, Mr. President; it is offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I do not care to speak on the amendment. If every Senator listened carefully to the reading of the amendment, I think it will be agreed to; and that will dispose of the present controversy. It will put the United States in the light in which it wishes to be put, and the hands of no representative of the United States will be tied.

My amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will merely affirm that our great Nation, which is the hope and light of freedom, has not lost faith in the people of the countries of Eastern Europe and Asia who are now under Communist control. I think my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will clarify the matter, and will permit the sense of the Senate to be known, without hampering anyone in our Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have sought to be recognized ever since the junior Senator from Wisconsin attacked the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Now that I have been recognized I rise to the defense of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, this afternoon we are writing pages of history which will be read and studied long after we become dust and ashes. I do not propose to have this RECORD closed today with the attack of the junior Senator from Wisconsin on the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] unanswered.

I am satisfied that under the rules of the Senate, the junior Senator from Wisconsin could have been called to order for his unwarranted reflections upon the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I did not call him to order, because I believe in unlimited, free debate in the Senate, subject, of course, to the reasonable limitations of the rules of decency and mutual respect which should prevail among Senators during debate. Also I had hoped that before the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] finished his speech, he would upon reflection, withdraw his attack upon the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

I wish to say that I do not know of a Member of the Senate who is a more noble patriot than is the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; and I do not know of any Member of the Senate of the United States whose record excels that of the Senator from Arkansas, as regards opposition to communism.

I think it is most regrettable that the unfair statement that the junior Senator from Wisconsin made this afternoon about the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has been placed on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for future generations to read.

Let us consider, for example, the record of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in connection with the great piece of legislation which is known as the Fulbright scholarship bill. Let any Member of the Senate point to a piece of legislation which has caused a more effective series of blows to be struck against communism in the world, than those which have been struck against communism by the Fulbright scholarship bill.

Mr. President, one of the most effective ways to show up communism in the world is to export to all corners of the world the American system of freedom, as we are doing through the educational processes made possible by the Fulbright scholarships.

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate can have great differences of opinion; but certainly there is a code of personal ethics in debate which should be followed by Senators. That code of debate should be based upon the major premise that each Member of the Senate acts out of a sincerity of motivation in support of the flag which stands behind the Presiding Officer's chair. I, for one Senator, have for the last time in the Senate listened in silence to the junior Senator from Wisconsin cast reflection upon the integrity of colleagues in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Oregon be called to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the Senator from Oregon is required to take his seat.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will not waste my time listening further to the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I wish to say that today, for the last time, have I sat in the Senate of the United States and listened in silence to the junior Senator from Wisconsin attempt to cast a reflection upon the integrity of a colleague in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the Senator from Oregon is required to take his seat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has not violated any rule of the Senate. I move that the Senator from Oregon be allowed to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the necessary motion is that the Senator from Oregon be allowed to proceed in order.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Fulbright	McCarthy
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Barkley	Green	McNamara
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bender	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Hruska	Neuberger
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bush	Jackson	Pastore
Butler	Jenner	Payne
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Carlson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Scott
Chavez	Kilgore	Smathers
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question in on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be permitted to proceed in order.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said before I was interrupted by the Senator from Wisconsin, for the last time do I intend to sit in my place on the floor of the Senate in silence while the Senator from Wisconsin casts reflections upon the integrity of any of my colleagues in the Senate.

The time has come, in my judgment, in the history of this session of Congress, to make it perfectly clear to all our colleagues—each and every one of the 96 of us—that there is a code of ethics which should govern us in debate in the Senate. We can have great differences of opinion among us on the merits of issues, and at the same time conform to a code of fair debate. I think it is a pretty sad reflection on the Senate and its history to have any Member of this body impugn the patriotism and integrity of any other Member of this body.

There is no basis in fact for impugning the patriotism of the great Senator from Arkansas, BILL FULBRIGHT. I consider him not only one of the great scholars of the Senate, not only one of the great public servants of the Senate, but one of the great Americans living today.

That is my reply to the Senator from Wisconsin. When one reads the RECORD tomorrow he cannot, in fairness, reach any other conclusion than that the Senator from Wisconsin tried to brush all over the Senator from Arkansas a smear of appeasement of communism. I happen to be one Member of the Senate who resents that kind of tactic in debate in the Senate.

Now let me say something about the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin. I believed that it ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I happened to believe that it ought to come back from the Foreign Relations Committee for action on the floor of the Senate, and that the Senator from Wisconsin was entitled to that consideration from the Foreign Relations Committee.

That is why I gave instructions, when I was obliged to leave after the first 45 minutes of the discussion yesterday afternoon, that my proxy should be voted to report the resolution unfavorably to the Senate. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin was entitled to that procedural consideration from the Foreign Relations Committee. Why? Because he represents a great sovereign State of the Union in the Senate of the United States, and the people of that State are entitled to effective representation, so long as he serves them in this body.

Procedurally the very essence of this resolution is time. We could not table the resolution in the committee without jeopardizing the time factor which confronted the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator from Wisconsin was fighting against time, in order to have presented to the United States Senate a point of view with which I am not in agreement, so far as his resolution is concerned. I thought that, representing the people of the sovereign State of Wisconsin, he ought to have an opportunity to obtain a vote on the floor of the Senate. That is why I took the position in the Committee on Foreign Relations that his resolution should be reported unfavorably to the floor of the Senate.

Let me say a word or two further with respect to the resolution itself. I shall not talk about motivations. Who are we, as mere human beings, to pass judgment upon the motivations of any colleague? I leave the question of motivation to be settled between each colleague and his Creator. However, I think it is clear on the record that the Senator from Wisconsin has at least given the American people the impression that he has been against a conference at the summit.

I happen to be one who believes that a conference at the summit is very important, not because I think much is going to be solved by a conference at the summit, but because, as I have been heard to say on the floor of the Senate many times during the past 10 years, I think we must carry this cold war propaganda fight to the Russians at all times. I do not think we ought ever to let the Russians create the vicious, lying impression around the world that we are afraid to go into a conference with them at the summit—or, for that matter, at a lower level.

I think we must always demonstrate to the people of the world that we are a Nation of peace, and that Russia is a nation of war. We must demonstrate at all times that we are willing to sit down and listen, with our ears and eyes open, cognizant of the fact—I think it is a fact, because there has been no demonstration by Russia that it is not a fact—that there is no intention on the part of the Russians but to deceive. I believe Russia has no intention to do anything but maneuver and manipulate, in an endeavor to take behind the Iron Curtain those areas of the world not now behind the Iron Curtain. Through false propaganda Russia hopes to influence areas where there are millions of people still in doubt about the high purposes of the United States. Those millions must be won over to the side of freedom, if the heritage of freedom is to be left for future centuries of American boys and girls. We must never give the Russians a propaganda weapon to use against us. A failure to be willing to meet with them at the summit would play right into their false propaganda about us.

That is why I want a conference at the summit, so far as my major reason is concerned.

As a secondary reason, let me say that, as a Christian, I always live in hope of a lasting peace. I believe that the affairs and the fate of man are divinely guided. I am always hopeful that a Divine expression may manifest itself at some time at such a conference, and that as the result of the will of providence we may reach some accord with the Communists in the promotion of peace.

In other words, I believe that we should never give up hope and that we should never stop trying to negotiate an honorable peace with the Russians. It is our clear spiritual duty.

For those two reasons I was among the first in the Senate to publicly urge a conference at the summit, and I urge it now. For those reasons I do not believe that we ought to throw any roadblocks into the path of the President of the United States by seeking to instruct him in advance as to a precondition which he must lay down in order to negotiate at all with the Russians. Why do I say that? I say it because the resolution itself can be used by the Communists as a means of embarrassing the President of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I refuse to yield at this time. Of course, the Russians, in my judgment, will not agree to any discussion of the satellite countries. If we want to break up the chances of having a conference at the summit, let us vote for the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin. I think it would be used by the Russians as a vehicle and as an instrumentality and as a weapon to accomplish what I believe is probably their basic aim, namely, a disruption of the conference. I do not think the Russians want a conference at the summit any more than does the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If we handle ourselves properly in this conference—and I believe the President and the Secretary of State are aware of the dangers—we can give the Russians a terrific shellacking so far as the propaganda war is concerned. By bringing them into the conference and sitting and listening to their propaganda, and then through our good-faith proposals showing the world who is on the side of peace and freedom, I think we win increasing millions to our cause. Therefore I am against the resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] because I think its passage would help the Russians disrupt the conference at the summit.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason I asked the Senator from Oregon to yield when I did was to commend him for pointing up the issues that are involved, and to say to him that he has stated the issues more clearly than they have been stated this afternoon. I want to say to the Senator from Oregon that he has done a very able job. That is why I wanted to interrupt him.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Minnesota is very kind.

Mr. LEHMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks in associating myself with the statement made earlier this afternoon by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] concerning the attack made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] on our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. What the Senator from Oregon said in that connection needed to be said. The remarks of the Senator from Oregon were fully justified. Certainly what happened here this afternoon was a most unfortunate occurrence reflecting on the dignity and the good faith of the United States Senate.

I also wish to congratulate heartily the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on the action he took in objecting to the attempt by the junior Senator from Wisconsin to withdraw his original resolution. If the Senator from Arkansas had not objected, I myself would have done so. I am very happy, indeed, that the Senator from Arkansas objected, and that later he also objected to the proposal to withdraw the preamble of the resolution of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate both the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on the position and the attitude they assumed this afternoon in the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] for his very kind words, and I also wish to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I thoroughly approve of the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Oregon regarding the procedure on the floor of the Senate. He has always contributed a great deal to orderly procedure in the Senate.

It is, of course, one of the outstanding characteristics of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] that

he has a capacity to disrupt the orderly procedure of whatever body or whatever committee in which he happens to be involved. I, myself, hesitated to answer him, because I was afraid that to do so would further delay the action of the Senate in obtaining a vote on the resolution.

However, I think it is an extremely dangerous and bad practice, for one Member of the Senate to attack another. So far as I personally am concerned, I am not offended in the slightest by whatever opinion the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] may have of me, as a personal matter.

But I wish to say that I do very much appreciate the statements which have been made by the junior Senator from New York and the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from New York for his very courteous remarks. I can think of no higher compliment than one coming from him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest for the consideration of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] that it would be more advisable—if he would be willing to do so and it met with the judgment of the Senate—to withdraw his amendment as it is presently constituted, and submit it as a new resolution and permit it to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

We are dealing with a very delicate matter. On the face of it there seems to be little that any Senator could object to in the amendment, but we have a complex situation today, and we are not in a position to amend the "whereas" clauses under the parliamentary situation as it presently exists.

If the Senator from Indiana on his own initiative would submit the amendment as a new resolution and have it referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and if the Secretary of State should complete the preliminary discussions which are now in progress in San Francisco within a day or two, we could have the Secretary of State come before the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss the resolution with us.

I am sure no one in the Senate wishes to do any harm to our basic foreign policy. I believe we ought to make clear today that we have a deep interest in the people who find themselves enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. I have no doubt that after proper hearings and proper procedure a resolution could come from the committee which I hope would receive the vote of all 96 Senators.

Of course, all I can do is to make the suggestion. I realize there may be some differences of opinion as to procedure. However, it seems to me that if the Senator were to follow that course we would have a new resolution before the committee, which I believe we would be able to get out of the committee within a reasonably short time.

Mr. JENNER. I would be happy to do that provided both resolutions are referred back to the committee and a new resolution is brought forth. I so move to recommit, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the Senator's motion?

Mr. JENNER. To recommit.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Indiana to move to recommit the original resolution. Is that correct?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; that is the only way we can get both resolutions to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, many and various attempts have been made to prevent the Senate from expressing itself on the pending business. As I said earlier in the day, I hope the Senate will not allow itself to be diverted from passing on the resolution.

I see some merit in the suggestion of the minority leader, that the proposed substitute of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations and that testimony be taken on it.

As I said earlier today, I am prepared to support before the committee an expression of the sense of the Senate with regard to the people who have been gobbled up behind the Iron Curtain.

However, the issue today is not that issue. The issue is whether at this moment, at this hour, we are going to say to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State that we, the Senate, will not face our responsibilities and give them an expression of confidence in line with their constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. President, I did not submit the resolution. I did not ask for its consideration. However, when it was submitted and when it was referred to the committee, and when the committee unanimously acted on it, I said to the committee, and I say to the Senate, that the issue had been joined, and the question had been raised with the American people. I said that no doubt we would be confronted with various diversionary moves, but that we must plow the furrow straight and go straight down the line, and let each Senator express himself on the resolution.

I can assure the Senator from Indiana and the minority leader that I will be glad to do everything within my power as an individual Senator to make certain that any resolution on which the President and the Secretary of State and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who is not present today, and Members on both sides of the aisle could agree on, will be brought before the Senate so that it would have an opportunity to act.

However, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the resolution reported by the committee, and I believe a majority of the Senators are willing and ready to express themselves on that question. If the Senator from Indiana desires to withdraw his own amendment, that is his privilege, but we cannot withdraw the McCarthy resolution, unless we want to dodge it and sweep it under the rug and not face up to it—unless we want to say that the Senate is fearful and does not want to make a decision and that some Members have confidence in the President and some do not have confidence in him so the Senate just sent the resolution back to the committee.

We can do that, if we vote for a motion to recommit the McCarthy resolution. I hope the Senator will not ask us to do that. I hope he will withdraw his motion. I shall be glad to join with the minority leader in seeing that his proposal receives prompt consideration. I have been criticized today because I gave the same assurance to the Senator from Wisconsin, but I am pleased at the prospect of the Senator from Indiana making the proposal he has made, provided it follows the usual procedure. I have not studied it, but as I understand, he desires the Senate to express its full support of any and all efforts of the President at any meeting or conference with other nations to state and confirm the deep interest of the American people in the present and future status of the nations of eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control.

I think the committee could take that, and I think it is somewhat encouraging to us and to all the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle that the Senator from Indiana feels that way about it. I see nothing in it, Mr. President, that would cause me to take issue. I should like to have the recommendations of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if they can give them shortly, and if the department concerned can give its acquiescence or approval, and if the constituted authorities express themselves on it. I would not necessarily go along with them, but I should like to have their advice before consideration. If Senators are willing to do that, we can vote on Resolution 116, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered, and I would not anticipate any further business today.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I was merely trying to do that which I thought would help my country and also would restate to the world the way the Senate feels about the problem. I came to the floor late last evening and found what the situation was. The McCarthy resolution was submitted, and he asked for immediate consideration and received it. If the majority leader is willing to accept my suggestion, I do not see why we cannot have a clean resolution disposing of the matter, at least, by tomorrow.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana to recommit.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the pending amendment the McCarthy amendment to the original resolution reported by the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has not withdrawn his substitute amendment, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I accept the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it in order for the author of the McCarthy amendment to accept an amendment by the Senator from Indiana to his resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin can accept the substitute of the Senator from Indiana to his substitute, but not to his resolution.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if the McCarthy amendment should be accepted, how would the resolution then read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion before the Senate is acted upon favorably, the motion on which the yeas and nays have been ordered, it would be a confirmation of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the amendment of the Senator from Indiana in substitution for the entire resolution of the Senator from Wisconsin, or only of his amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The McCarthy resolution contains a series of "whereases." There is nothing we can do about amending any of the "whereases." They are there, and will be there as long as the resolution is before the Senate. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the resolution.

As the Senator from Kentucky brought out earlier today, we can amend, strike out, add to, or change anything after line 1 on page 2 of the resolution, in the resolving clause. That has been done. We have had a suggestion from the Senator from Indiana that he would be glad to recommit the whole thing. The Senator from Wisconsin has agreed to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana. I do not know whether they have thought it through; but whether they have or not, it shows the wisdom of having the committee go into these things. I think it is very dangerous to start legislating foreign policy on the floor of the Senate under any circumstances, without the most careful scrutiny by the committee, the staff, and the Department.

The resolution now provides:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that at said foreign ministers' meeting at San Francisco or at such other meeting or occasion as may be appropriate, prior to any such conference between the heads of state, the Secretary of State should secure the agreement of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France that the present and future status of the nations of Eastern Europe and Asia now under Communist control shall be a subject for discussion at such conference between the heads of state.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, is it planned to substitute the language of the proposal of the Senator from Indiana for the language now in the resolving clause?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. So that the language of the proposal of the Senator from Indiana is a substitute for the language of the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin, and he has agreed to that language?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I had understood that it was a substitute for the entire resolution.

Mr. JENNER. No; only for what follows the resolving clause.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is the voice of Jacob and the hand of Esau. I hope the Senate will not agree. I hope not many Members will agree to this shotgun procedure. On a question of such delicacy, with a conference going on at San Francisco and another big one coming up, we can trust the committee which has given the issue thoughtful study, and I hope the Senate will vote this proposition down.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for his explanation. The thought I had in mind when I asked the question was that, while, so far as I was personally concerned, I understood the situation, I did not think the RECORD would show a clear statement of exactly what we were to vote upon. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator, as usual, is thorough, and I appreciate his suggestion.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance that I rise to speak on this matter at this time. However, I should like first, to make a parliamentary inquiry in order to be certain that we are correct, namely, that none of the "whereas" clauses of the resolution may be stricken at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is correct. May the Chair, for the information not only of the Senator from Colorado but of all Senators, invite attention to the fact that rule XXIIII on page 29 of the manual states as follows:

When a bill or resolution is accompanied by a preamble, the question shall first be put on the bill or resolution and then on the preamble.

Mr. ALLOTT. That being the case, I shall discuss the matter very briefly. The next to the last whereas clause in the resolution reads:

Whereas failure to discuss said areas under Communist control at said Geneva meeting implies de jure recognition of Communist domination of said areas, and thus the establishment of a permanent threat to the safety, peace, and independence of the United States.

Bouvier, and I think every other lawyer understands that de jure means by right, or by right of law, or lawfully, as distinguished from de facto, which means something which exists or is in existence, but not necessarily by right, or by right of law. De jure means rightfully, lawfully, or by legal title.

Therefore, if I were to vote for the resolution, it would mean that I would be voting for a statement that the failure to discuss the matter at the Geneva meeting implies the de jure recognition of Communist domination of certain areas. I am not willing to make such a statement myself, nor am I willing to vote for such a statement as is contained in the resolution.

Under the ruling of the Chair a few minutes ago, this may be later considered, after the resolving part of the resolution proper has been voted on; but then I would place myself in the position of having voted for a resolution, a part of which I cannot embrace and in which I do not believe.

Therefore, also embracing the general principle which has been stated innumerable times upon the floor this afternoon, I do not believe in hamstringing the executive of our Government when he attempts to negotiate with other countries. Nor should we try to write foreign policy upon the floor of the Senate.

I cannot and will not endorse the statement which is made in the "whereas" clause to which I have referred, and which I implore Senators to read. Let Senators ask themselves whether they are willing to say, by voting for it, that the failure to discuss that subject at the forthcoming conference implies de jure recognition of the Communist countries. I urge Senators to read that clause and to ask themselves whether they are willing, by voting for the resolution, to endorse such a statement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. Not at the moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield for 10 seconds?

Mr. ALLOTT. Very well; I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I call the Senator's attention to something which he may not have heard the Chair say; that is, that the Senate will vote first upon the resolution itself; and then, under the rule, the preamble will be voted upon. So the "whereas" clauses will not be voted on originally. The first vote will be upon the Jenner substitute. If that is agreed to, then the Senate will vote upon the "whereas" clauses. So the Senator will have two separate votes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I believe I have the situation clear in my mind.

As I stated a few moments ago, if I vote for the resolution, I shall have to vote for it in the hope that this particular "whereas" clause will later be stricken. If it should not be stricken, then I would find myself in the position of having voted for a resolution, a part of which I believe to be false and which I cannot possibly endorse.

Therefore, I shall vote against the resolution. I am sorry the rules of the Senate make it necessary to do so in this way. But it is a fact that I might find myself in that position, as every other Senator on the floor might also.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I thought the Senator from Colorado had concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not correct that the Senate vote first on the Jenner substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The JENNER amendment having been accepted as a modification, the vote will

come on the McCARTHY substitute, as modified by the JENNER amendment.

Mr. JENNER. If the Jenner substitute shall be approved, then the preamble will be subject to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. JENNER. Then the preamble will be subject to amendment. So any objections which Senators may have, such as the Senator from Colorado has raised, can be taken care of.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senate proceeds on the assumption that the preamble will be amended over the objections which have been raised, I do not think that is correct. I understand that the preamble cannot be touched until the Senate has adopted the resolution.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, in order to clarify the situation, I ask unanimous consent to strike the preamble of the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. JENNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the original resolution. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution. A negative vote will carry out the recommendation of the committee. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the United Nations anniversary celebration in San Francisco as representative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. FLANDERS, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 77, as follows:

YEAS—4

Jenner	Malone	McCarthy
Langer		

NAYS—77

Allott	Frear	McNamara
Anderson	Fulbright	Millikin
Barkley	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kefauver	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Clements	Knowland	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Symington
Daniel	Lehman	Thye
Douglas	Long	Watkins
Duff	Mansfield	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Young
Ervin	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken	George	Potter
Cotton	Goldwater	Russell
Dirksen	Humphrey	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Magnuson	Thurmond
Flanders	Murray	Wiley

So the resolution (S. Res. 116) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The preamble accompanying a resolution which is rejected by the Senate is not acted upon.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that my amendment was not acted upon, but only the Jenner amendment to my amendment has been acted upon, what is the status of my amendment at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the amendments are dead.

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words, even though the amendment was not acted upon, it dies with the rejection of the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was acted upon, because action was taken on the substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator accepted the substitute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words to what has already been said regarding the action of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I desire to compliment him, and to say that I think his leadership, in connection with the action taken this afternoon by the Senate, shows statesmanship of the highest order. The rejection of the resolution which would have injected the Senate into the very delicate negotiations regarding the so-called meeting at the summit, was a very fine contribution to the dignity, the orderliness, and the security of this body and of our constitutional system. I wish to say that I think the senior Senator from Texas has made a very great contribution to the work of the Senate and to the security of the Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I can only say that there is no Member of the Senate whom I would rather have feel that way about me than my friend of long standing, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I appreciate it very, very much.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to second what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has said. In fact, I would go a little further, and would say that the magnificent work and leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] have brought the Senate to an action which I believe serves notice to the rest of the world of our unity and our solidarity behind the President of the United States at the forthcoming conferences. I use advisedly the phrase "the forthcoming conferences," because I think the impending conference is only one of several which will be necessary.

In my opinion, the finest thing we could do was to serve notice on the entire world that, regardless of partisanship, the Members of the Senate are backing the President of the United States in whatever move he may make toward bringing about better understanding among the nations of the world.

So I desire to compliment the distinguished majority leader for the fine contribution he has made to that end.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, requested the Senate to return to the House the message of the House

notifying the Senate that the House had concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop.

The message announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House.

H. R. 947. An act for the relief of Carl E. Edwards;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Moses Aaron Butterman; and

H. R. 1660. An act for the relief of Wencenty Peter Winiarski.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5046) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. DENTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, Mr. HAND, and Mr. JENSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5240) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 50 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MAHON, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. GARY, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. SHELLEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. FENTON, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 932. An act for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock (nee Nikolajewicz);

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Svend J. Skou;

H. R. 1179. An act for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon;

H. R. 1180. An act for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson;

H. R. 1301. An act for the relief of Karlis Abele;

H. R. 1302. An act for the relief of Adelheid Walla Spring;

H. R. 1304. An act for the relief of Mother Amata (Maria Cartiglia), Sister Ottavia (Concetta Zisa), Sister Giovina (Rosina Vitale), and Sister Olga (Calogera Zeffiro);

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Paul Compagnino;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of Ervin Benedikt;

H. R. 1439. An act for the relief of Menachem Hersz Kalisz;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of Joseph Righetti and Marjorie Righetti;

H. R. 1698. An act for the relief of Anne Cheng;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Charlotte Schwalm;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens;

H. R. 1987. An act for the relief of Kimie Hayashi Crandall;

H. R. 2059. An act for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan;

H. R. 2070. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Amalia Bertolino Querio;

H. R. 2242. An act for the relief of Kim Joong Yoon;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Alfonso;

H. R. 2259. An act for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Maria de Rehbinder;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Julius, Ilona, and Henry Flehner;

H. R. 2313. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnethe Gundhil Sundby;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Charles S. Youngcourt;

H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife;

H. R. 2749. An act for the relief of George Risto Divitkos; and

H. R. 2753. An act for the relief of Geraldine Gean Hunt and Linda Marie Hunt.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of Harold C. Nelson and Dewey L. Young;

H. R. 1069. An act for the relief of Hussein Kamel Moustafa;

H. R. 1202. An act for the relief of Robert H. Merritt;

H. R. 1400. An act for the relief of David R. Click;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of W. H. Robinson & Co.;

H. R. 1416. An act for the relief of J. B. Phipps;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Constantine Nitsas;

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of the estate of James F. Casey;

H. R. 2456. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell;

H. R. 2529. An act for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.;

H. R. 2760. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sally Rice;

H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of George L. F. Allen;

H. R. 3958. An act for the relief of Louis Elterman;

H. R. 4714. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Harris;

H. R. 5196. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.;

H. R. 5923. An act to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial gift from the Government of Venezuela.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 932. An act for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock (nee Nikolajewicz);

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Svend J. Skou;

H. R. 1179. An act for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon;

H. R. 1180. An act for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson;

H. R. 1301. An act for the relief of Karlis Abele;

H. R. 1302. An act for the relief of Adelheid Walla Spring;

H. R. 1304. An act for the relief of Mother Amata (Maria Cartiglia), Sister Ottavia (Concetta Zisa), Sister Giovina (Rosina Vitale), and Sister Olga (Calogera Zeffiro);

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Paul Compagnino;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of Ervin Benedikt;

H. R. 1439. An act for the relief of Menachem Hersz Kalisz;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of Joseph Righetti and Marjorie Righetti;

H. R. 1698. An act for the relief of Anne Cheng;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Charlotte Schwalm;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens;

H. R. 1987. An act for the relief of Kimie Hayashi Crandall;

H. R. 2059. An act for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan;

H. R. 2070. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Amalia Bertolino Querio;

H. R. 2242. An act for the relief of Kim Joong Yoon;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Alfonso;

H. R. 2259. An act for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Maria de Rehbinder;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Julius, Ilona, and Henry Flehner;

H. R. 2313. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnethe Gundhil Sundby;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Charles S. Youngcourt;

H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife;

H. R. 2749. An act for the relief of George Risto Divitkos;

H. R. 2753. An act for the relief of Geraldine Gean Hunt and Linda Marie Hunt;

H. R. 2755. An act for the relief of Benjamin Johnson;

H. R. 2783. An act for the relief of Andrew Wing-Huen Tsang;

H. R. 2944. An act for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball;

H. R. 2947. An act for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Dorothy Claire Maurice;

H. R. 3507. An act for the relief of Luise Pempfer (now Mrs. William L. Adams);

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulou;

H. R. 3625. An act for the relief of George Vourderis;

H. R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ilse Werner;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nika Kirihara;

H. R. 3630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza;

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufield;

H. R. 3871. An act for the relief of Orville Ennis;

H. R. 4284. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mariannina Monaco;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Christa Harkrader;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 5021. An act for the relief of Harriet L. Barchet; and

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4663. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Duncan McQuagge; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ELIMINATION OF CUMULATIVE VOTING SHARES OF STOCK OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I have recognition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have a bill made the unfinished business before the Senate. Then I shall yield to any Senator who desires to speak or make insertions in the RECORD.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 243, S. 256. I wish to state that if the motion is agreed to there will be no votes today on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. YUSUKE TSURUMI, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF COUNCILLORS OF JAPAN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased to have as my guest in the Senate today a member of the Japanese House of Councillors, a parliamentary body of Japan, Mr. Yusuke Tsurumi, who is a visitor in this country. I should like to have him stand so he may receive the greetings of the Senate.

(Mr. Tsurumi rose and was greeted by the Senate with applause.)

WEEKLY REPORT BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON THE REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I am presenting the weekly report furnished me by the Department of State. This report is dated June 17, 1955, and shows that under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Public Law 203, 83d Congress, a total of 35,096 visas has been issued. Last week, the figure representing the total number of visas was 33,959, and the number of visas issued that week was 1,020. This week, 1,137 visas were issued. The distribution by different countries, based on the report of June 17, is as follows:

Country:	*Total issued*
Italy	21,320
Greece	5,812
Netherlands	617
Germany	3,004
Austria	2,859
Far East	889
Others	68

As for the number of persons actually admitted to this country, I know the Senate will be interested to know that the total admissions on June 17 were 23,333. This figure represents refugees, relatives, and orphans; and the number for each category is as follows:

Refugees, escapees, and expellees	4,163
Relatives	18,392
Orphans	778

In order that the Senate may be kept informed of the actual work being done under this act, I shall continue to report on the status of visa applications under the refugee relief program.

Mr. President, I send forward the statistical statement on the refugee relief program, dated June 17, 1955, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Refugee relief program, status of visa applications, June 17, 1955

	Italy	Greece	Netherlands	Germany	Austria	France	Great Britain	Belgium	Far East	Others	Total
1. Applicants notified of documents required	68,421	19,079	1,417	22,942	12,010	2,124	905	1,513	2,682	436	131,529
2. Visas issued	21,320	5,812	617	3,004	2,859	131	139	257	889	68	35,096
3. Visas refused	1,646	765	32	2,067	945	152	120	24	622	22	6,395
4. Canceled action	563	140	140	1,114	674	96	126	118	74	43	3,088
5. Applicants still in process	44,892	12,362	628	16,757	7,532	1,745	520	1,114	1,097	303	86,950
6. Assurances received by Administrator	6,785	10,086	426	12,661	4,812	1,261	959	688	3,068	1,395	42,141
7. Assurances canceled, returned	688	737	117	805	166	86	132	13	426	370	3,540
8. Assurances verified and sent to field	5,816	8,990	264	11,386	4,493	1,100	752	623	2,478	902	36,804

NOTES

All figures cumulative.
Items 6, 7, and 8 reflect principal aliens only.

Items 1 through 5, status of applicants.
Items 6 through 8, status of assurances.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 9, the Honorable Philip B. Perlman, former solicitor general of the United States, and one of the most eminent and public-spirited men I know, testified before the Subcommittee on Government employees' security program headed by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. That testimony was one of the most compelling and effective presentations on the subject of the administration's security program that it has ever been my pleasure to read.

Although Mr. Perlman's testimony received widespread attention in the press, it was, of course, reported only in small part. I think this testimony makes such an effective argument against the security program that it deserves to be read by every Member of the Senate and to be made a permanent part of the RECORD.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Perlman's remarks be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am here in response to your invitation to discuss the employee security program, as established and operated by the current national administration. You have been authorized by the Senate of the 84th Congress (1st sess.), under the provisions of Senate Resolution 20, adopted February 21, 1955, to make a full and complete study and investigation of that program, and then to report the results, together with such recommendation as you may deem advisable.

At least two other subcommittees of the 84th Congress have been giving consideration to the various phases of the employee security program. Criticism of that program has already been voiced in hearings held by the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. The acting chairman of that subcommittee, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, came to the conclusion that there is no security program, "but only a mass of security programs—as many programs as there are agencies." And Senator HUMPHREY, together with Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, has sponsored a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 21, to estab-

lish a Commission on Government Security, to study all phases of the Government security operations and procedures, and to make appropriate recommendations. The Humphrey subcommittee has approved the resolution for the appointment of a study commission, but there are persuasive reasons, discussed hereinafter, why the proposed resolution should not be adopted. The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has begun an investigation of abuses of civil rights, and it may be assumed that no inquiry into such a subject can be conducted without consideration of the impact of the employee security program upon the rights, express and implied, of Government employees; and also the effect of what is known as the industrial security program on the millions of employees of private industry engaged in work under Government contract.

It is to be regretted that this subcommittee's investigation is confined to the Government employee security program. The industrial security program is operated at the instance of the Department of Defense, and follows, in important features, the procedures established under the employee security program. Many of the evils and abuses which have characterized the administration of the employee security program occur in the administration of the industrial security program, but even if that program is not yet under investigation by the Congress there is a reasonable expectation that any improvements which may be made in the employee security program as the result of the investigation or recommendations of this committee may be incorporated into the industrial security program.

The great importance to the Nation of the security measures you are investigating is indicated by recent rough estimates of the number of those whose employment is subject to the security tests prescribed in various acts of Congress, Executive orders, and other official action. They are listed as follows: Government civil employees, 2,300,000; armed services, 3 million; Atomic Energy Commission and its contractors, 130,000; port security program, 500,000; industrial security program, more than 3 million. These great numbers omit those who have been or are being subjected to loyalty or security tests by State and municipal governments, and by unofficial systems of one kind or another in professions, and in private employments of all kinds and descriptions. What has been and is being done, good and bad, by the Federal Government in the name of national security is being imitated and even enlarged in many areas of employment where any connection with national security, as that word has come to be understood, is so remote as to be practically nonexistent. This state of affairs should not be surprising, in view of the fact that the employee security program, as established by President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450, April 29, 1953, applies to all employees of all agencies of the Federal Government, whether or not engaged in employments involving national security consideration.

The deep interest shown by the 84th Congress in the operations of the employee security program is the result of the conclusion reached by many that the program, as now constituted, is itself the source of much of the insecurity felt by the American people; that its administration in too many, but fortunately not all, of the agencies has been delegated to incompetent, unqualified, biased, or politically motivated officials, and that, generally speaking, it is revealed as one of the most potent and ruthless weapons against the freedoms and liberties and rights of the people ever promulgated by a President of the United States. I do not believe I overstate what to me is a clear and present danger from this program to the principles of equal justice upon which the Constitution and Bill of Rights are founded. I am one of those outraged by the perversion of needed security laws and rules into instruments for the satisfaction of indefensible political ends, and private prejudices, grudges, and spleen.

I am reluctant to believe that President Eisenhower knows or understands the extent of the evils inherent in his security program. I prefer to believe that the truth has somehow escaped him, although the daily press, the magazines, and other publications have been emphasizing the need for revision, and giving wide publicity to cases which should never have been allowed to occur in our country. My faith in President Eisenhower's good intentions has been somewhat shattered by a number of incidents which have received nationwide attention. For instance, Wolf Ladejinsky, an expert on agricultural problems of vital import to the United States, especially in the conduct at this time of its foreign relations, was cleared for service in the State Department, but was declared a security risk and refused employment in the Department of Agriculture. He was then cleared by the Foreign Operations Administration, and sent abroad as this country's representative. So he remains a security risk and unfit for employment in the Department of Agriculture, but he is not a security risk and is available for employment in at least two other, perhaps all other, agencies of the Federal Government. What could be more ridiculous than such a situation as this—one that, it should be regretfully added, was expressly approved by the President of the United States? What greater indictment of the entire employee security program could be drawn than the bare statement of the facts of this case?

Incredible as it may seem, there are even worse cases which have been brought to the President's attention, and on which no corrective action has been taken by him or anyone else. I mention, for example, the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, one of our greatest scientists and former Director of the Bureau of Standards. In that capacity his researches were so valuable to the Nation that Dr. Edward Teller, who is credited with leadership in the work through which the hydrogen bomb became available, has said that Dr. Condon advanced the completion of the project, upon which the safety of the entire Nation now so greatly depends, by many months, perhaps as much as a year. After being cleared at least three times under loyalty programs previously in force, Dr. Condon became the director of research for the Corning Glass Works, New York, and he was again investigated and given a hearing under the industrial security program. He was cleared for the fourth time in July 1954, but the fact of the clearance was not published until October 19, 1954—3 months later. Two days after the publication, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Charles S. Thomas, was announcing on radio and television that he had revoked Dr. Condon's clearance. The Vice President of the United States, from Butte, Mont., and from other western points, where he was engaged in making speeches in the political campaign then approaching a climax, was quoted as saying that he had intervened in the matter. Secretary Thomas gave no understandable reason for his belated revocation of the decision made by the board created for the purpose of taking the testimony and passing upon the merits of the case. Vice President Nixon had no official duties with respect to the employee security program or the industrial security program. His intervention in the Condon case, assuming he was correctly quoted in the New York Times, is inexplicable except, perhaps, on grounds of political expediency. It remains only to be pointed out that if the decisions of any of the Federal security boards or panels can be annulled at the pleasure or whim of the head of the agency, or through the intervention of outsiders to the proceedings, weeks and months after the decisions have been made and the parties notified, then there is no security program worthy of the name. Government by law, or regulation or rule adopted pursuant to law, ceases to exist under such circumstances.

With these and other deplorable instances of injustices before him, it can be understood why Dr. Vannevar Bush, president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington and one of our greatest scientists, was impelled to say in an address delivered in December 1954:

"The test in this country is whether we can truly maintain our freedoms and guard our way of life against threats from without, against subversion within, and against our own errors and aberrations. We have the evil practice of ruthless, ambitious men who use our loyalty procedures for political purposes. Suspicion and distrust are rampant in the land."

Perhaps it should be emphasized that I am not dealing with the question as to whether the accused persons I have named should be regarded as security risks. I have not read the records in the cases and I do not know of my own knowledge whether there was ever any reasonable basis for the proceedings. What I do know, however, is that any program or system under which a person can be solemnly declared to be a security risk in one agency of the Government of the United States, especially an agency concerned with agricultural problems, and at the same time hold a complete clearance from the Department of State and from the Foreign Operations Administration, lacks honest, intelligent and impartial administration, and is a national disgrace. And so I take this opportunity to call the attention of the subcommittee to the case of the renowned scientist, apparently entitled to the lasting gratitude of the Nation, persecuted while in public office and hounded while in private employment, his clearance approved by the tribunal charged with the responsibility and revoked at the instance of ruthless politicians to make a sensation during a political campaign.

President Eisenhower's Executive Order No. 10450, creating the Employee Security Program, subjects all Federal civilian officers and employees, concerning whom there may be unevaluated derogatory information, to the danger of being suspended without notice and without pay; and, further, to the permanent loss of public employment on allegations from undisclosed sources.

Executive Order No. 10450 abolished the loyalty program, established by President Truman under the provisions of Executive Order No. 9835, March 21, 1947, and adopted new procedures, applicable to all derelictions charged against civilian officers and employees—from actual disloyalty down to disagreeable or unsuitable behavior. It completely eliminated the preexisting distinction between loyalty and nonloyalty cases, and opened the way for the unfortunate effort by high officials of the present national administration to make it appear, for political purposes, that all separations from Federal employment involved subversion or disloyalty.

The distinction between loyalty and nonloyalty cases, previously so carefully preserved, except where specifically authorized by acts of Congress in agencies engaged in highly confidential and sensitive operations, was continued during the existence of the loyalty program. That program was adopted in accordance with recommendations made in a report to President Truman by his Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty, created by Executive Order No. 9806, November 25, 1946. The Commission was composed of representatives from the Departments of Justice, State, Treasury, War,

Navy, and by the President of the Civil Service Commission. The report contained a statement of the historical background of inquiries, beginning in 1939, into matters concerning the loyalty to the United States of employees and applicants for Federal employment. Before 1939 such inquiries were not made, except in emergency periods, such as during World War I, and, indeed, were regarded by the Civil Service Commission as prohibited under Civil Service Rule I, adopted in 1884, and which provided: "No question in any form or application in any examination shall be so framed as to elicit information concerning the political or religious opinions or affiliations of any applicant, nor shall any inquiry be made concerning such opinions, or affiliations, and all disclosures thereof shall be discountenanced." The original Hatch Act of August 2, 1939, prohibited Government employees from membership in any organization advocating the overthrow of the Government, and from that time there were a succession of acts, listed in the report, relating to the same subject. From 1941 through December 1946 there were a total number of 9,604,935 placements in Federal service, 392,889 completed investigations, and 1,307 persons found to be ineligible on loyalty grounds, a little more than three-tenths of 1 percent. Of all those found to be ineligible for employment, 43,537—3.3 percent—were barred on loyalty grounds.

The employee security program jumbled together in one program cases involving loyalty; security, as distinguished from loyalty; and unsuitability, as distinguished from loyalty. That mixture is supposed to have been authorized by the act of August 26, 1950 (5 U. S. C. 22–1 et seq.). The employee security program, however, is in direct violation of the intent of Congress, clearly expressed at the time of the passage of the act upon which it is claimed to be based. For that reason, and also because the employee security program is inconsistent with important provisions of the act, there is substantial ground upon which to doubt the validity of the entire Executive order. (The constitutionality of the loyalty program adopted in 1947 and revoked in 1953 was questioned but not decided in the Supreme Court in *Peters* v. *Hobby* (No. 376, October term, 1954, June 6, 1955); and the validity of the employee security program is challenged in *Cole* v. *Young* (No. 12,526, in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit)).

It should be noted that many of the safeguards against unfair and discriminatory treatment of Federal employees, existing under the previous program, were destroyed by Executive Order No. 10450, and the regulations subsequently adopted. An employee, once suspended without pay, may wait an indefinite length of time before his case is heard by a board appointed by his agency head, and he may never know what the hearing board decided. There is no appeal from the action of the agency head. A suspended employee labors under the handicap of a presumption of guilt, a concept foreign to the basic principles of our form of government and to the traditions inherited from Anglo-Saxon common law. Of course, no such presumption is written into the Executive order or into the agency regulations, but it is implicit in the procedures in the program. The employee, faced with charges as vague as his agency may choose, in the name of security, to make them, is forced to prove his innocence beyond any doubt to the satisfaction of those who started the proceedings against him. And that, because, among other reasons, most of the hearing boards are composed of employees from other agencies, conscious of the risk they run of having their conclusions questioned by congressional investigating committees, or by their own agency heads, is usually an exceedingly difficult task.

No good reason for this situation exists in the axiom, usually advanced in discussions of the subject, that nobody has a legal right to be a policeman, or to any other public employment. The rules or regulations applicable to applicants for a public job are one thing—the Government's conduct toward those it has accepted for permanent employment is quite another. Laws enacted by Congress over a long period of years, and regulations adopted in pursuance of those laws, were designed to vest certain rights in Government employees for the purpose of building a career service immune from invasions by politicians hoping to benefit from the spoils system, or lack of system.

There were, before the adoption of the employee security program, provisions in Federal laws granting certain departments and agencies, engaged in operations the disclosure of which would be detrimental to the United States, authority to suspend without pay, pending final determination on the merits, civilian officers and employees believed to be security risks. Before 1950, when the present law on that subject was enacted, such authority was vested in the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General and the Atomic Energy Commission. The act of August 26, 1950 (5 U. S. C. 22–1 et seq.), added three additional groups of employees in three sensitive agencies—the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Security Resources Board, and the Coast Guard (under the Treasury Department).

When the bill which finally became the act of August 26, 1950 (Public Law 733 of the 81st Cong. 2d sess.) was pending in the 2d session of the 81st Congress as H. R. 7439, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service made a report (No. 2330, June 26, 1950), in which it was stated:

"The bill does not deal with the suspension or removal of disloyal Federal employees. Executive Order 9835 of March 21, 1947, establishes procedures under which employees who are found to be disloyal are removed from the Federal Government. This bill is concerned with the all-important problem of dealing with those Federal employees who, although loyal to the United States, act in a manner which jeopardizes national security, either through wanton carelessness or general disregard for the public good. The committee believes it is impossible to treat security risks and disloyal employees in the same manner. Disloyal persons should not be employed in the Federal service, and where they are found and removed they are not entitled to Federal employmnt of any kind. On the other hand, if it is determined that a person separated as a security risk is qualified and suitable for other Federal employment, the committee believes that it is appropriate for such employee to work for the Government in nonsensitive Government agencies. The bill makes ample provision for the employment in nonsensitive agencies of certain of those employees who may be classified in sensitive departments and agencies as security risks."

After it had passed the House, the bill went to the Senate, and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. In its report (No. 2158, July 25, 1950), the Senate committee said:

"It will be noticed that the bill, as amended, is not designed to set aside the President's loyalty program. It is intended that his program will be continued."

The Senate report repeated substantially the views of the House committee:

"Executive Order 9835 of March 21, 1947, established procedures under which employees found to be disloyal, as distinct from poor security risks, could be removed from the Federal Government."

"This bill is concerned primarily with the problem of dealing with those Federal employees who, although loyal, are so careless as to jeopardize the national security. Disloyal persons should not be permitted to be employed in the Federal service under any circumstances. They are not entitled to Federal employment of any kind. On the other hand, it is the opinion of the committee that if the Civil Service Commission so determines, a person separated as a security risk could be placed in another Federal job where the work is of such a nature as not to be jeopardized by his employment.

"The bill, as amended, provides that the individual concerned can ask the Civil Service Commission to review his case to determine whether or not he is suitable for reemployment in a nonsensitive agency. The bill does not provide an appeal from the decision of the head of the department whose action will be final and conclusive insofar as action affecting the individual in his own agency is concerned."

It seems beyond dispute, therefore, that (1) the act of 1950 contemplated the continuance of the Loyalty Program and not its abolition; that (2) the congressional committees envisioned a security risk as one not involving disloyalty, and believed it impossible to treat security risks and disloyal employees in the same manner; and that (3) it was intended that the sensitive agencies should be limited in number, and that a person found to be a security risk in a sensitive agency should be available for employment in a nonsensitive agency.

The heads of the few departments and agencies specifically named were the only ones given authority to suspend civilian officers and employees without notice and without pay, and, following such investigation and review as deemed necessary, to terminate the employment of any suspended officer or employee.

However, the act of August 26, 1950, contained a section which provided that in addition to the departments and agencies named in the act its provisions would apply to such other departments and agencies as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary in the best interests of national security. It should be noted that the President's authority to add departments and agencies was limited to the requirements of national security. That this restricted grant of power was never intended to be used as authority to extend the coverage of the act of 1950 to every department and agency of the Federal Government is made certain, not only by the statements in the reports of both the House and Senate committees but by the detailed provisions in the act itself for the employment in some other department or agency, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, of persons whose services were terminated by a department or agency under the provisions of the act. This provision has now become obsolete. A security risk, except in the Ladejinsky case, is not transferred for the simple reason that no agencies employ persons already determined to be security risks.

President Truman used the power to add to the number of sensitive agencies only once. He added the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Company by Executive Order No. 10237, April 26, 1951.

Before President Eisenhower's Executive order of April 27, 1953, became effective, Federal civilian officers and employees could be separated from employment under the authority of the provisions of—

1. The Lloyd-La Follette Act (37 Stat. 555 (1912), as amended; 62 Stat. 354 (1948), 5 U. S. C. A. sec. 652 (a)), and various related laws, Executive orders and regulations, including especially the regulations adopted by the Civil Service Commission: The Lloyd-La Follette Act, as amended, provides that no person in the classified civil service shall be removed or suspended therefrom without pay except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of such service and for reasons

given in writing. It is provided that before any action can be taken the person whose removal or suspension without pay is sought shall have notice in writing of the charges against him, be furnished with a copy of the charges, be allowed a reasonable time to answer the charges, file affidavits, and be furnished with a written decision on his answer. The regulations provide that the employee shall be retained in an active duty or annual leave status until final decision. One of the main purposes of the Lloyd-La Follette Act and the regulations was to protect employees in the classified service from removal for purely political reasons.

2. The loyalty program, established by Executive Order No. 9835, March 21, 1947, as amended: Under that program, from December 1947, through December 1952, more than 6,600,000 persons had been checked for loyalty and security, and more than 25,500 persons had been given FBI full field investigations; 6,411 persons either had been dismissed, denied employment, resigned, or withdrew applications for employment. Under its provisions each Federal department and agency set up its own loyalty board to pass upon the merits of charges or derogatory information affecting its employees. These boards, armed with FBI and other reports, held hearings at which the person under accusation was present and was entitled to produce witnesses and to be represented by counsel. Each loyalty board made a recommendation on each case to the head of the agency in which the board functioned. If the action of the loyalty board was adverse to the employee, there was an appeal to or review by the head of the agency, and if the decision was still adverse, the employee had a right of appeal to the Loyalty Review Board, which reviewed all the proceedings, and made its independent recommendation. The cases of applicants for appointment, and all others except permanent employees were heard and determined by the Civil Service Commission's regional loyalty boards, and there also was provision for appeal to the Loyalty Review Board. This board, which reached 22 in number, was composed of eminent citizens, distinguished in the professions and industry, appointed by the Civil Service Commission without regard to political affiliation. In fact, the Loyalty Review Board, during President Truman's administration, was headed by persons who happened to belong to the opposite political party. The provision for successive appeals, the absence of secrecy in the conduct of the proceedings, the opportunity for public discussion of the cases, served, despite handicaps inherent in measures to protect confidential sources and methods of obtaining information, to provide what was believed by many to be a reasonably adequate program to shield innocent employees from injustice and discrimination. At the same time, the loyalty program helped to eliminate any communistic or other subversive elements in Government service, and, together with the Hatch and other related acts of Congress, to assure the employment of none but those completely loyal to the Government. The loyalty program was far from perfect. It was an experiment, thrust upon the Nation by the existence of a worldwide conspiracy to infiltrate, undermine, and weaken all democratic governments; to learn and exploit their secrets, and to sow dissension and fear and strife. Some mistakes were made in the administration of the loyalty program, and the way opened for abuses, the extent of which are now becoming apparent.

It has now been decided (June 6, 1955) by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Peters case, that the Loyalty Review Board had no authority to post-audit cases, and to reverse, by its own motion, the findings of agency loyalty boards in favor of accused employees. The right of confrontation of accusers and the right of cross-examination have been so generally breached under the security programs that there is a serious question as to whether the resulting injustice to suspected persons and the weakening of safeguards upon which all free citizens are accustomed to rely are necessary to promote the national security. The accused employees and even hearing boards are not informed as to whether it is actually necessary to withhold the identity of accusers for actual security reasons, or whether, as must be the situation in some cases, the informers prefer to remain secret in order better to perpetrate an injustice. The Government, I assume, would not deliberately protect such people but its officials do not seem to have any choice. Then, too, there has been a tendency, because of inexperience and because of pressure from those seeking political advantage, to place undue emphasis upon trivial incidents and circumstances, and to build up theories of guilt by association—theories under which nets could be woven of sufficient width to entrap almost everybody.

One glaring defect, inherited and enlarged by the security program, is the rehearing or retrial, time and again, of the same charges based on the same information. It seems impossible for any Government employee, once derogatory information of any character reaches his files, to obtain final and permanent clearance. Any charge or hearing, however innocent of wrongdoing the employee may be, produces a cloud which hangs permanently over the personnel record of the employee and militates against his chances of promotion or employment elsewhere, even in another place in the same government. In an effort to devise a plan under which duplication of investigations, of hearings and of successive clearances would be eliminated, the previous administration was at work on an employee fitness program when its tenure of office came to an end. That project was never completed.

It is worthy of the heaviest possible emphasis that under the loyalty program as established by Executive Order No. 9835, March 21, 1947, and as thereafter administered, no person was separated from Government service or was taken off the Government payrolls and his livelihood endangered or destroyed, until his case had been adjudicated, after opportunity to present his defenses either to the agency or the reviewing loyalty board. There were practically no exceptions to this rule. That is not the situation today.

3. The act of August 26, 1950 (ch. 803, Public Law 733, sec. 1, 64 Stat. 476, U. S. C. A. 5, sec. 22-1, and Executive Order No. 10237, April 26, 1951), which designated the particular sensitive departments and agencies, the heads of which, in the interests of national security, were given power of summary suspension of officers and employees without pay. The suspended employee is entitled to notice of the reasons for his suspension only to the extent that the agency head determines that the interests of national security permit. The employee is given an opportunity within 30 days to file statements or affidavits to show why he should be restored to duty. The agency head is given power to terminate completely the employment of a suspended civilian officer or employee whenever necessary or advisable in the interest of national security.

Congress intended, as the committee reports prove, that all three of these avenues for the removal of employees should remain in effect for use by the heads of departments and agencies—the Lloyd-La Follette Act for the suspension and removal of incompetent, unqualified, and otherwise undesirable employees; the loyalty program for the removal of the disloyal and the subversive, and the act of 1950 for the removal of security risks, as distinguished from those disloyal. The congressional committees said that they intended the act of 1950 to relate only to the problem of dealing with Federal employees who, although loyal to the United States, "act in a manner which jeopardizes national security, either through wanton carelessness or general disregard for the public good." The conclusion that it was impossible to treat disloyal persons and security risks in the same manner was based mainly on the ground that disloyal persons should not be employed anywhere in the Federal service, but that persons found to be security risks, where matters of a confidential or sensitive nature are handled, might be qualified and suitable for employment in a nonsensitive agency.

It may seem to be curious that final determinations in cases of subversion and disloyalty involved procedures for notice, hearing, and successive appeals, although employees charged with being security risks—and not with disloyalty—might be removed from sensitive agencies without notice and without pay, pending final action. On reflection, the reason seems obvious. As already stated, it was provided in the act of Congress that any official or employee deemed unsuitable as a security risk in sensitive agencies, which were comparatively few in number, would, if qualified for employment elsewhere in government, be eligible for such employment. Then, too, a determination of disloyalty to the United States, carries with it a permanent stigma, a judgment which may bar the accused from public employment anywhere in the United States, and which may close the door to opportunities for private employment as well. In addition, such a determination may invite criminal prosecutions. The offender, under any circumstances, is marked for life. Because, therefore, in cases involving such grave consequences to the accused, and where conclusions are reached without the aid of juries and without the rules of evidence observed in the courts, President Truman, on the recommendations of his Commission, in his Executive order establishing the loyalty program, attempted to minimize the danger of abuse through provisions for hearings, appeals, and for a full consideration by competent, disinterested persons unlikely to be subjected to or influenced by political or other extraneous influences.

Although the loyalty program contemplated that a person under charges might be suspended from the actual performance of duties pending a determination as to loyalty, the presumption of innocence until a determination otherwise was implicit in all the provisions of the loyalty program. Congress knew of the safeguards and approved them, as the committee reports indicate. In addition the statutory provisions for suspension and removal under the Lloyd-La Follette Act, the various other acts of Congress, and Executive orders, were intended to give the heads of departments ample authority to free the Government service of inefficient, incompetent, and sometimes corrupt employees who manage from time to time to obtain public employment, as they do also in private enterprise. No such suspensions or removals ordinarily, except where a crime is involved, carry a permanent stigma, nor the consequences incident to a determination of disloyalty.

The effect of President Eisenhower's order of April 27, 1953, was to make, for the purposes of the security program established by that order, every department and agency of the Federal Government a sensitive department or agency, whether handling confidential matters or not. The simultaneous abolition of the entire loyalty program, together with all of the machinery and procedures for handling loyalty cases, and the merging of all loyalty and security cases into one program and one set of general procedures with regulations of details left to each agency, contrary to the express intent of Congress, compels every civilian employee

of the Federal Government to work under conditions where anonymous charges lacking any tangible basis may be used to deprive him of his livelihood temporarily and, perhaps permanently, to subject him to suspension without notice and without pay; and where, if any action is taken against him, there is a presumption of guilt which imposes upon him the heavy burden of establishing his innocence. This burden usually cannot be met without heavy expense for gathering witnesses, for the preparation of affidavits, for the employment of lawyers, for the cost of a stenographic transcript of testimony—and all this occurs during the period when the employee is under suspension without pay and therefore without the income upon which, in many cases, he is absolutely dependent.

Under the provisions of the Executive order establishing the employee security program, and the regulations prepared by Attorney General Brownell for the Justice Department, the authority conferred upon the head of the department to make summary suspensions without pay was delegated to the heads of divisions, bureaus, services, boards, and officers. The heads of other departments and agencies of Government have delegated authority to such officer or officers as have been selected by them. It is now evident that many such selections have not been carefully and prudently made, and it should be pointed out that neither the Executive order nor the sample regulations prepared by the Attorney General for use by all departments and agencies contain provisions specifying any particular qualifications for those entrusted with the heavy responsibility of evaluating information and of determining whether or not to initiate proceedings against other officials and employees. Upon the receipt of derogatory information relating to criteria set forth in the regulations the evaluation of such information takes place, and then there is a determination as to whether suspension is necessary. The criteria include, among more specific items, information concerning any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that the employee is not reliable or trustworthy. If suspension is ordered, it occurs immediately and there is a period not exceeding 30 days before the employee is advised in writing of the charges against him. It is provided in the sample regulations that the statement of charges "shall be as specific and detailed as security considerations, including the need for protection of confidential sources of information, permit and shall be subject to amendment within 30 days of issuance."

So that now all the employee is told about the charges against him is what a division head or other superior official, and the agency's security officer, decide to tell him. Important facts, needed for an adequate defense, may be withheld in the discretion of the security officer because of alleged security considerations and the need for protecting confidential sources of information, although the employee concerned may never know whether the reason was valid. Under the loyalty program measures for protecting the national security and the sources of confidential information were included, but it was also provided that the accused official or employee should be informed in writing of the nature of the charges against him in sufficient detail, "so that he will be enabled to prepare his defense." The Eisenhower-Brownell program, as embodied in the Executive order, contains no such provision. The Executive order does not require that an accused employee, whether it be on loyalty or any other charges, no matter how serious or how comparatively trivial, be told anything in particular. The regulations prepared by the Attorney General for the Justice Department merely provide that "said statement of charges shall be as specific as security considerations permit" (sec. 9 (c)).

Inasmuch as security, for the purposes of the program, includes all derelictions of duty, it may be wondered just what application such a general and vague formula can or should have to cases in which loyalty plays no part; and also how, in loyalty cases, a defense can be prepared if the charges are as general and vague as the formula itself. A statement of charges is analogous to an indictment, and in many instances, now that loyalty, and security, and everything else is scrambled together, the consequences of such charges may be just as severe on the accused as an indictment formally returned by a grand jury. But under the Eisenhower-Brownell employee security program, the employee, his means of livelihood at stake, is to be told only what his superiors decide security considerations may permit.

Except in those few departments and agencies where different security regulations have been adopted, a suspended employee is given 30 days to make his answer and file supporting affidavits, after which he is entitled to a hearing before a hearing board of not less than 3 civilian officers or employees of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, established a special board to hear the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, naming three outstanding citizens not in Government employment; and the Department of the Navy, in addition to its security hearing boards, established under the act of August 26, 1950 (Public Law 733, 81st Cong.) and the Eisenhower Executive Order 10450, has created a security appeal board, which reviews the findings of the hearing boards for the guidance of the officer to whom authority to take final action was delegated by the Secretary of the Navy (the procedure followed in the much publicized case of Abraham Chasanow, an employee in the Navy Hydrographic Office).

The sample regulations prepared by the Attorney General provide that no person shall serve as a member of a security hearing board in the case of an employee with whom he is acquainted. There is no provision fixing the time within which, after the answer is filed, the hearing should take place. Presumably at least 2 months elapse from the date of suspension until the answer is filed, and thereafter there is no time limit on any of the prescribed procedures. The security hearing board will be selected and will sit whenever arrangements are made by the department or agency head, or by those to whom the authority is delegated. After the hearing is over, the board is required to make a decision in writing, and the department or agency head then makes the final determination. There is no provision for a time within which, after a hearing is held, a decision should be reached either by the hearing board or finally by the department or agency head. The employee may be held under suspension without pay for an indefinite period. If the final decision is favorable, he is reimbursed, if he is a permanent employee, for the salary withheld during the period of suspension, but he is not reimbursed for the costs he incurred, and they are certain to be substantial, in meeting the burden of proving his innocence. Moreover, any employee without permanent status who is suspended and thereafter reinstated may be deprived of all pay during the period he was mistakenly or wrongfully suspended. The Comptroller General has ruled that the act of August 26, 1950 (Public Law 733, 81st Cong.) providing for compensation does not apply in such cases, and litigation is pending.

The innocent employee, while awaiting the final decision, is forced into a dilemma. It is to his interest to wait, at whatever cost, and whatever deprivation. If he seeks employment elsewhere, he is handicapped by the fact that unresolved charges are pending against him. If his needs force him to apply elsewhere, and if he is successful in obtaining other employment, his case may never be adjudicated and the charges remain as a permanent cloud over his good name, a handicap to future employment in the Federal Government, and a serious obstacle to opportunities for position and promotion in private employment.

If, on the other hand, he waits and the decision is adverse to him, he is left without remedy, irreparably and permanently injured. There is no appeal. Moreover, he may never know what the hearing board decided, whether its decision was unanimous or whether there was a dissent. The hearings are private. The regulations provide that there shall be present at the hearing only the members of the hearing board, the stenographer, the employee, his counsel, the agency employees concerned, and the witnesses when actually giving testimony. As originally sent to the various department and agency heads, the proposed regulations drafted by the Attorney General provided that a copy of the decision of the hearing board should be sent to the employee. When he came to put the regulations into effect in his own Department—the Department of Justice—the Attorney General not only eliminated this provision but expressly provided (sec. 11 (N)) that "the employee shall not be advised of the decision of the board or of the dissenting opinion of any of its members." So, in the Department of Justice, and in such other departments and agencies as have adopted the same procedures, the suspended employee does not know whether the final decision which determines his fate follows the findings of the hearing board, or whether it overrules and ignores the conclusions of those who heard the testimony in the case. Because of the different regulations there is no uniform practice, and employees in one department or agency may be given information denied to employees elsewhere in Government.

It seems difficult to arrive at a sound reason for withholding such information from the accused employee, especially where the members of hearing boards are picked by the heads of the departments or agencies in which the charges against employees are issued from lists maintained by the Civil Service Commission. The lack of any right of appeal puts the employee at the mercy, if any, of those who formulate the charge against him. They are the subordinates of the head of the department or agency, and may be presumed to be abiding by and enforcing his policies as to employees as well as operations. In any event, most of the hearing boards are in a difficult situation. Its members are not usually heads of departments or agencies, or outside of the Government, as in the Oppenheimer case, and, therefore, their ability to hold their own positions may be endangered if they antagonize others possessing great power and authority. The demand made, from time to time, by congressional investigating committees for the names of those who gave clearance to or dismissed charges against officials and employees under attack is sufficient warning to every member of a security hearing board that conclusions reached by them may be the subject of investigation and criticism, if not in accord with the opinions of subsequent investigators. The widespread fears endangered by the character of investigations conducted by congressional committees, and the natural reluctance of any Government official or employee to become involved in any such procedures contribute to difficulties in arriving at entirely objective findings. In view of the present climate of opinion in this country, members of hearing boards can hardly be blamed for feeling that the well-publicized demagogs of the day are peering over their shoulders and breathing down their necks. And where, as in the Department of Justice, such findings are to be kept secret from the employee involved, the chances for injustice would seem to multiply.

The abolition of the loyalty program and the substitution of the new procedures for the adjudication of practically every conceivable kind of charge from simple bad behavior to treason has resulted in the equation of the term "security risk" with subversion or communism. The public impression that they are all one and the same thing has been fostered by recent events. For a period of time it was the practice of officials high in Government to announce the total number of persons suspended or dismissed or who had resigned, or who had for any reason or no reason been added to the number of security risks, together with statements relating to communism or subversion. For instance, when the Attorney General, under extremely dramatic circumstances, testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in an attempt to substantiate his assault on President Truman in the matter of the Harry Dexter White case, he suggested that the subcommittee should examine with great care the reasons given for keeping White in Government employment, and also examine the record of what had been done to protect the national security. And the Attorney General said:

"Despite difficulties stemming from past laxity, 1,456 employees have been separated from Federal Government payrolls since January 1953, on the grounds that they are security risks. More cases are still under consideration.

"Our work to date has clearly shown the need for at least two new laws to help the Government in the prosecution of espionage cases."

The Attorney General sandwiched the figure of 1,456 security risks between comments on the Harry Dexter White case and recommendations for new espionage laws. The unavoidable conclusion from this treatment of the employee security program was that the security risk cases, or most of them, were espionage cases, or involving disloyalty in some form. The Attorney General, at the same hearing, admitted, under questioning that some of the cases involved drunkenness and some involved sexual perversion, but the Attorney General was content to leave it at that, and never then or thereafter attempted to give a clear idea as to what the 1,456 cases really involved. The figure of 1,456, used by the Attorney General in November 1953, had already been given out at the White House during the latter part of October. On December 4, 1953, Governor Dewey of New York made the statement that the 1,456 alleged security risks had been planted in the Government of the United States under Democratic administrations, and coupled that statement with the observation that it is nice to have a government which is not infested with spies and traitors. Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY said publicly that practically all of the 1,456 were removed because of Communist connections and activities. Postmaster General Summerfield made statements giving the same impression and Bernard Shanley, the President's legal adviser, who later made complete retraction, said that 1,456 subversives had been kicked out of the Government. And there are many other instances of similar statements by Cabinet officers and lesser officials of the national administration, as well as those contained in press releases issued under the auspices of the Republican National Committee.

Later on, the number of security separations, still practically indistinguishable from cases involving communism and subversion, was raised to 2,200, and then to 2,500. More recently the number generally used has increased to 8,008.

Due, however, to persistent inquiries made by the press and by members of congressional committees in the Senate and House, it has been learned that the number of security risk cases, so far as the departments and agencies in Washington are concerned, do not involve a single known Communist, and outside of Washington, and including all the nearly 2,500,000 Federal employees, there are indications that only 1 alleged Communist, and he an obscure person in an unimportant position, is supposed to have been found. Inasmuch as his identity and the place—somewhere in the Northwest—where he is supposed to have been employed have not been revealed, and there is no information that he has been prosecuted for violation of the Hatch Act or the Smith Act or any other act, that single vague exception seems on the verge of disappearance.

In the State Department, under attack for years, there have been several hundred security-risk cases, but these did not include the case of a single Communist; the Security Director there, at an early stage of congressional inquiry into what began to be called a numbers racket, said that only 11 cases involved loyalty charges, and of those only 4 cases were begun under the present administration. It may be assumed that the number is now larger. The Justice Department's security-risk cases at that time involved loyalty charges in only 8 cases, and there, as elsewhere, no known Communists were involved. But perhaps just as important information as the relatively few number of loyalty cases is the fact, finally uncovered with difficulty, that the number of security-risk cases publicized by the administration includes many cases of resignations, and even deaths, where no final determinations based on evidence were ever made or ever can be made. The number of alleged security-risk cases announced by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission even includes many cases of transfers of employees from one department to another.

The chairman of this committee, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, as far back as January 1954, when the alleged security risks numbered but 2,200, challenged Attorney General Brownell to support his charges of large numbers of subversives in Government. Senator JOHNSTON pointed out that every Federal employee must take an oath of office, and publicly demanded that the Attorney General disclose the number of indictments, if any, he obtained from among those dismissed as security risks. "If there are none, as I suspect," said Senator JOHNSTON, "then he should resign his office." If any of the original 1,456 security risks, or the later 2,200, 2,500, 8,008, or any number dismissed since the Eisenhower security program went into effect has been indicted or tried or convicted for obtaining governmental employment while holding membership in an organization advocating the overthrow of the Government, that fact has escaped my notice. I am under the impression that, despite all the propaganda about Communists and other subversives in Federal employment, no such cases have ever been brought, as I am sure that, if any, they are so few in number as to be unworthy of public attention.

There is no doubt, however, that every possible device has been used to make it appear that great numbers of subversives were in the Federal service when the present program went into effect, ignoring the results obtained under the previous program and the laws in effect since 1939. And there is no doubt that the programs adopted upon the abolition in 1953 of the loyalty program have inflicted untold hardship and misery and ruination upon many innocent Government employees and employees of private industries and the families of both public and private employees. Last February the Secretary of Defense issued a directive, to take effect in April, designed to eliminate unnecessary suspensions of defense-plant workers. The General Counsel of the Defense Department admitted there has been more than a desirable number of offhand suspensions by plant security officers, and cases dragged from 6 months to a year.

About 1 month later Attorney General Brownell wrote a letter to the President in which he advocated emphasis on 7 matters of procedure, in an attempt to improve the operation of the employee-security program. Those seven points have been discussed before this committee by former Senator Harry P. Cain, member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. As Senator Cain pointed out, the new improvements work no real change in program, but are simply methods of administration which should have been effective from the beginning. The Washington Post and Times Herald, in an editorial, March 9, 1955, said that "The major objection continues to be one that has plagued the loyalty program from the beginning—that there is no objective check on the veracity of the accusers."

This subcommittee has incorporated in the record the Attorney General's seven points, and his letter to the President and the President's reply. But the Executive order has not been amended on these points. They remain merely an advisory letter to agency heads, and they will be honored or not as subordinate security officials decide. Perhaps now there will be presuspension notice and conferences; and perhaps now security officials will be a little more careful in recommending suspensions on unevaluated information before an employee is given an opportunity to suggest that the information may be misleading or even false. Perhaps it may become as unpopular to suspend employees without reasonable basis as it has been popular to pile up figures of suspensions and dismissals for the edification of an uninformed public. This subcommittee, in the course of its investigation, should obtain, from every agency, the inexcusable cost to the Government of the suspensions which both before and after hearings resulted in reinstatements. It will be found that the Government has paid out, and will continue to pay out vast sums to employees who were not allowed to work during the period of suspension. The cost to the employees in money, as well as in anguish and worry and damage to reputation has already been mentioned, and this, despite the Attorney General's letter, will continue until definite, understandable standards are adopted by the administration and enforced by trained, qualified security officers.

Senator Cain recommends that the act of August 26, 1950 (Public Law 733 of the 81st Cong.) be amended so as to vest agency heads with discretion to retain Government employees on duty during the determination of security charges against them. Senator Cain has been misinformed as to the necessity to amend the law in this particular. It may be that the Justice Department construes the act of Congress as requiring suspensions without pay when charges are preferred, but I would not think such an interpretation is sound.

In the first place, even if the law now reads that way, there is nothing in it which prevents the agency head, or his security officers, from giving an employee against whom there is derogatory information such opportunity as may be deemed advisable to answer and submit proof in defense. There could be extended investigation and consideration, and the merits pro and con could be examined in detail before any charges are formally brought. Under these circumstances, there would be no suspensions unless the head of the agency or other responsible official is first satisfied that there is no adequate defense.

But I call your attention to the plain language of the act. It provides that the head of each of the sensitive agencies named by Congress (and presumably those added by the President) "may, in his absolute discretion, and when deemed necessary in the interest of national security, suspend, without

pay, any civilian officer or employee" of the designated agencies. The act of Congress says "may, in his absolute discretion," and I don't know how anyone can torture that permissive language into a mandate to suspend summarily without pay. It should be remembered that one of the very purposes of the act was to authorize, when the necessity arose, suspensions which before then could be questioned. To amend the act to grant authority to retain the services of employees against whom derogatory information has been received is to attempt to reverse what Congress thought necessary in 1950. If there is any difficulty about the authority of the agencies to retain the services of those awaiting clearance or dismissal, the difficulty is due to the President's Executive Order No. 10450. Section 6 of that order provides that "Should there develop at any stage of investigation information indicating that the employment of any officer or employee of the Government may not be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, the head of the department or agency concerned, or his representative, shall immediately suspend the employment of the person involved if he deems such suspension necessary in the interests of national security, * * *," so that, although the Executive order is couched in mandatory terms, the determination to suspend immediately prior to investigation and hearing is dependent in each case upon a finding that the suspension itself is necessary in the interests of national defense. The great mass of cases involving matters unrelated to loyalty, and the large number of so-called loyalty cases in which the derogatory information is flimsy and indefinite and vague should be sufficient proof that the policy of mandatory suspension prior to hearing is not warranted either by the act of Congress or by an accurate interpretation of the Executive order. Certainly whatever ambiguity there may be in the Executive order could be cleared up overnight by an appropriate amendment issued by the President. The Attorney General has already taken a halting quarter or maybe a half step in the proper direction by emphasizing the need for notice and conference with an employee before any action is taken against him. The Attorney General's action itself negates the idea that the act of Congress is mandatory in the matter of suspensions without notice and without pay—the source of much of the discrimination, misery, and injustice imposed by irresponsible, ignorant, and foolish public officials, unworthy to exercise the great authority and power with which they have been clothed as officials of the Government of the United States.

Executive Order No. 10450 has already been amended four times by President Eisenhower. Two of the amendments, Executive Order 10491 (18 F. R. 6583, October 16, 1953) and Executive Order 10531 (19 F. R. 3069, May 28, 1954) gave express authority to dismiss under the security program any employee who refuses, upon the ground of self-incrimination, to testify before a congressional committee regarding charges of disloyalty or other misconduct. This action was hailed at the time as an important security measure, but there can be no doubt that such authority already existed under various laws and regulations. It might be interesting to learn whether any employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government ever claimed the privilege against self-incrimination before a congressional committee. Another amendment of the program was contained in Executive Order No. 10550 (19 F. R. 4981, August 7, 1954) requiring the Civil Service Commission to report the results of its study of the program, and to make recommendations to the National Security Council at least semi-annually; and requiring the head of each agency to report to the Civil Service Commission the action taken on each full field investigation, so that the information could be included in the reports by the Civil Service Commission to the National Security Council. The other amendment, Executive Order 10548, 19 F. R. 4871, August 4, 1954, applied the security program to employees suffering any illness, including any mental condition, which may cause significant defect in their judgment or reliability.

The sole change made by President Truman in the Loyalty Program as adopted in 1947 occurred in Executive Order 10241 (16 F. R. 3690, April 28, 1951) when he changed the standard for dismissal from one that required a finding that "on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States," to a standard that "on all the evidence there is reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the person involved to the Government of the United States."

The manner in which the Employee Security Program has been administered, and the effort to couple a comparatively few disloyalty cases with transfers, resignations and deaths, and with more or less routine derelictions of duty of the kind previously processed under laws and procedures long in effect, has been disastrous to the morale of the Government service. No more moving testimony has been given as to what the situation is in the Federal service as a result of continuous attacks, of investigations and trials of individuals under departmental security regulations, than that contained in the letter published in the New York Times January 17, 1954, by former distinguished ambassadors and diplomats Norman Armour, Robert Woods Bliss, Joseph C. Grew, William Phillips and G. Howland Shaw, in which it was said that:

"Fear is playing an important part in American life at the present time. As a result, the self-confidence, the confidence in others, the sense of fair play and the instinct to protect the rights of the nonconformist are—temporarily, it is to be hoped—in abeyance. But it would be tragic if this fear, expressing itself in an exaggerated emphasis on security, should lead us to cripple the Foreign Service, our first line of national defense, at the very time when its effectiveness is essential to our filling the place which history has assigned to us."

What is true of the Foreign Service of the State Department applies to the other great and vital departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The wholesale slanders and smears against the Federal service has damaged the departments and agencies, and injured the whole Nation. The most devastating effect, however, is suffered by individuals who may be driven, without just cause, from public service, their careers ruined; and who, as a result, may find it difficult to obtain suitable employment in private enterprise. No complete and satisfactory breakdown of the operations of the so-called employee security program will ever be made. Even if the exact number of actual loyalty cases, as distinguished from other security risk cases, could be ascertained, that number would not reveal the basis on which the determinations were made. Some statements indicate that the numbers of security risk cases include cases in which "derogatory loyalty information was in the files," whatever that may mean. Nobody without access to the files knows whether the alleged information is in fact information, or how much of it is unevaluated, unproved and unprovable libel, the fruit of the activities of the demagog, the crackpot, the malicious slanderer, the reckless and irresponsible purveyor of the entirely false and the half-truth, the evil generator of fear and prejudice. The confidential informants who supplied what is called information in the files may be one or more of these things, but the employee who is deprived of his livelihood may never know the character and source of the so-called information that may be kept from him but which may have influenced a final determination against him. The chairman of the Civil Service Commission, testifying sometime ago before the House Civil Service Committee on a total of 422 loyalty cases, in none of which, so far as he knew, there was proof of communism, said there was some derogatory information in the files concerning loyalty—and that is all that seems to be known publicly about the cases. So even where hearing boards under the employee security program make adverse findings there is no way in which such findings can be analyzed against the evidence, for there is no disclosure, in the Department of Justice and other departments and agencies, as to what the hearing board decided, and no appeal. The existence in all departments and agencies of fear of criticism, and the spreading of fear by the publication of unfounded claims of the number of security cases—as security was intended to be defined by Congress—militates against fair hearings and fair decisions on security risk cases. The spectacle, so familiar these days, of continuous repetition of accusations, sometimes after being frequently disproved, until confused with and accepted as proof of guilt; the dramatic performances, carried to the far corners of the Nation by radio and television, staged by high officials of Government; the vast amount of publicity on the subject in newspapers and magazines, all have contributed to the creation of a climate in which distrust, fear, and suspicion have become widespread, and begin to make it extremely doubtful whether any employee of Government, at any level, can obtain a fair and impartial determination of charges against him.

When the employee security program was put into effect in April 1953, it was advertised and received by many leading newspapers as a means of correcting the popular impression, resulting from years of unfavorable propaganda, that the Federal service contained substantial numbers of espionage agents, disloyalists, drunks, perverts, and incompetents. The new program was to remedy all that. "The practical effect of this change," said the New York Times (April 30, 1953) "is that henceforth an employee dismissed from Federal service under the security program does not necessarily bear the onus of disloyalty." He does not necessarily bear the onus of disloyalty. But in reality, he does. It was not generally understood that the program made every agency of the Government a sensitive agency; made every employee subject to suspension without notice, without pay, and without appeal, and subjected every employee, when charges are preferred, to a presumption of guilt which no criminal, no matter how long and how bad a record he may have, is required to face. Neither was it thought that separations from the Federal service under the so-called security program would be used so as to make it appear to the people of the Nation that all of them, or most of them, involved cases of disloyalty, and the balance drunkenness or perversion. So far, therefore, from removing the onus of disloyalty from Government employees who may leave the service for other reasons, the employee security program is the instrument through which they are endangered.

The March 1954 edition of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science is devoted to the subject of bureaucracy and democratic government. In an article entitled "Security of Tenure—Career or Sinecure," by O. Glenn Stahl, who is executive vice chairman, Interagency Advisory Group, United States Civil Service Commission, points out that Philip Young, Chairman of the Commission, has said that "the people who work for Government have even greater loyalty, more idealism, a stronger desire to get a job done and get it well done than employees of private industry." And Dr. Stahl wrote:

"Devastating, despairing, and ignorant criticism of public servants and of their effectiveness is in deadly contradiction to our

vital need to attract and to hold outstanding qualified people in the public service. It has in it the germs of destruction of all Government. No more subtle method of subversion exists and none plays more into the hands of the Communists than the recurrent campaigns of insidious, blanket derogation of public employees as a class. Nor is the situation helped by periodic forays into employee activities by demagogs, whether disguised in the name of national security or in the name of efficiency. It is high time that public servants were taken off the defensive and given recognition for their genuine achievements rather than notoriety for the misdeeds of a few."

The Attorney General informed the annual conference of the Civil Liberties Clearing House that "we will be the losers if, in our efforts to combat those who would destroy our civil liberties, we sacrifice them." There are those who believe that some liberties have already been infringed, if not sacrificed, by the program drafted by the Attorney General and signed by the President of the United States.

RECOMMENDATIONS

With the situation confronting this subcommittee, as I have attempted to outline it, it would seem to me that there is every reason why you should, as your investigation continues, draft a bill establishing a loyalty and security program, applicable to all agencies of the Federal Government.

In my opinion no commission such as is proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 21 is needed to investigate what you are already charged with investigating, although it may be advisable for you to seek an extension of your jurisdiction, so as to include consideration of such procedures as are provided by the industrial security program, and such subjects as are included in the special authority proposed for the President with respect to private employments in S. 681, introduced by Senator BUTLER, January 24, 1955.

The Government should have one overall security program, not a mass of programs, under which there are different regulations in different agencies, with no real uniformity throughout the executive branch of the Government. Suitable exceptions, as in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, could be preserved.

This subcommittee could obtain any assistance it may need from its own staff and from any group of lawyers in private practice it may designate to prepare such a bill for your consideration. And it can be done promptly. The appointment of a commission would mean long and unnecessary delay before any real improvements are made or a new program adopted. But if it is determined, for any reason, to delay legislation at this time, then I would urge you not to approve a resolution giving the appointment of the commission to officials of the present administration. It is proposed to have a commission of 12, 4 to be appointed by President Eisenhower, 4 by Vice President NIXON, and 4 by Speaker RAYBURN. Under this proposal, eight of the commissioners would be named by the President and Vice President, both of whom seem satisfied with the existing program, and who, therefore, would be reluctant to sponsor any changes. If there is to be any commission, I would suggest that its members be named in the resolution itself, and not left to the officials who are responsible for the creation and administration of the existing program.

Any new program should contain whatever provisions are advisable and necessary to rid Government service of any subversives who may have infiltrated; and necessary to keep any subversives out. That is the prime purpose of any such program, and every good citizen will support any reasonable measure designed to achieve that desirable goal without opening the door to base political schemes, and the triumph of the defamer, and the irresponsible demagogue. While protecting sources of information where actual and bona fide security considerations are involved, it is certainly possible to observe to the fullest measure practicable the rights and the liberties and freedoms inherent in our institutions of government. We have strayed far from a government of law in the matter of national security. This subcommittee is in a position to guide the way back.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

RETURN TO THE SENATE OF SENATOR CLEMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am delighted, happy, and joyful to see that the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has returned to his duties in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, my friend from Texas is very kind. I want him to know that he is no happier to see me back than I am to be back.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have talked with the minority leader about the subject I now mention. However, I should like to have a statement appear in the RECORD to the effect that, if the report is available—and we expect it to be available—the District of Columbia appropriation bill will probably be taken up for consideration after the morning hour tomorrow. I refer to House bill 6239.

I will say further, for the information of Senators and others who may read this portion of the RECORD, that I am informed that the bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and unanimously by the full committee. So far as I am aware, there will be no yea-and-nay votes. I am not in a position to say to the Senate what business will be taken up during the remainder of the week because the Senate itself is in a better situation than are some of its committees. It may be that after tomorrow the Senate may recess for a day or two in order to enable Senators to attend conference committee meetings and perform other committee work, so that there may be some business for the calendar.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that consideration of Senate bill 1713 was held up because the minority views had not been filed. They were filed only a few moments ago. While, as one of the cosponsors of the bill, I do not agree with the minority views, that bill might be added to the list of measures ready for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will ask the staff to make a check, and see if that bill can be scheduled for consideration at an early date.

Mr. BARRETT. Very well.

NOMINATION OF MERLIN A. HYMEL TO BE POSTMASTER AT EDGARD, LA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, when the Executive Calendar was called earlier in the day I asked that the nomination of Merlin A. Hymel, to be postmaster at Edgard, La.—a nomination which had been reported adversely from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—be passed over, because the minority leader wished additional time to study it.

Since then I have conferred with the minority leader, and I am under the impression that it is agreeable to him to have the Senate act upon that nomination. I wish to confirm that impression. I serve notice that when the Executive Calendar is called tomorrow, action will be taken on that nomination. In the meantime, I shall check with the minority leader.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the vote in committee was unanimous.

ORRIN J. BISHOP—RETURN OF MESSAGE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives requesting return of the message informing the Senate of the passage of House bill 4249, for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary be directed to return to the House, pursuant to its request, the message referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no Senators desire to make any further statements, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 23, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 22, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Wilber Marion Brucker, of Michigan, to be Secretary of the Army.

JUDGE, UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mary H. Donlon, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Genevieve R. Cline, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., 294A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for temporary appointment

as lieutenant general, United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Hugh Arthur Parker, 505A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter Irwin Miller, AO913582, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John Paul Doyle, 274A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Manning Eugene Tillery, 293A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward Pont Mechling, 327A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frank Hamlet Robinson, 336A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter Robertson Agee, 413A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold Winfield Grant, 497A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry Keppler Mooney, 589A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Judson Reeves, 1082A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Patrick Gerrity, 1613A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier general

Col. Leslie Granger Mulzer, AO138777, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John Caswell Crosthwaite, 295A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert Scott Israel, Jr., 354A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edgar Alexander Sirmyer, Jr., 394A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawrence McIlroy Guyer, 454A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald Philip Graul, 455A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John Coleman Horton, 457A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Winslow Carroll Morse, 515A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William Leroy Kennedy, 517A, Regular Air Force.

Col. George Frank McGuire, 539A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edward Bone Gallant, 577A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Julian Merritt Chappell, 583A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edward Nolen Backus, 604A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert Lee Scott, Jr., 640A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James Simon Cathroe, 18821A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert Edward Lee, 19033A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William Charles Kingsbury, 923A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Charles Anthony Heim, 1033A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Haskell Erva Neal, 1047A, Regular Air Force.

Col. George Bernard Dany, 1061A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Perry Bruce Griffith, 1075A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William Harvey Wise, 1083A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John William White, 1087A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert Morris Stillman, 1114A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas Joseph Gent, Jr., 1130A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Dolf Edward Muehleisen, 1144A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harold Lee Neely, 1161A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John Edward Murray, AO372910, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Emmett Buckner Cassady, 1095A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Cecil Edward Combs, 1203A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawrence Clinton Coddington, 1275A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Avelin Paul Tacon, Jr., 1566A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Claude Edwin Putnam, Jr., 1593A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Frank Edwin Rouse, 1595A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William Kemp Martin, 1697A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ralph Lowell Wassell, 1730A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Horace Milton Wade, 1872A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph Randall Holzapple, 1897A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph James Preston, 1966A, Regular Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22, 1955:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Hobson J. Horton, Fort Payne.

ARIZONA

Clarence Mortimer Palmer, Jr., Tombstone.

CALIFORNIA

Owen J. Underwood, Placentia.
Ray F. Hawkins, Vallejo.

GEORGIA

William B. Haskins, Dudley.

IDAHO

Thomas M. Vaughn, Richfield.

INDIANA

Bonita M. Weimann, Laketon.
Lee H. Williamson, Rolling Prairie.

IOWA

Glenn O. Jones, Atlantic.
George R. Helble, Bettendorf.
Allan H. Rohwer, Dixon.
Clarence A. Norland, Marshalltown.
Thursa L. Hinchliff, Minburn.
Ila O. Benge, Pleasantville.
David L. Rundberg, Yale.

KANSAS

Gordon K. Ethridge, Ada.
Wayne E. Rinne, Gardner.
Richard A. Carpenter, Girard.
Everett J. Fritts, Gorham.
Jean D. Fretz, Liberal.
Harold H. Kneisel, Powhattan.

MAINE

Allan Joseph Wentworth, Kittery.

MASSACHUSETTS

Roger H. Hinds, Canton.

MISSISSIPPI

Lealon P. Yarber, Belmont.

NEBRASKA

Norris P. Sensel, Culbertson.
James L. Vrba, Howells.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Gerald P. Merrill, Pittsburg.

NEW JERSEY

Helen B. Abbott, Alloway.
Helen A. Grod, Hackensack.

NEW MEXICO

Bill Foster, Portales.

NEW YORK

Ida Mae Hopkins, Cincinnatus.
Eva H. Chambers, Dresden.
Ignatius Fafinski, Dunkirk.
William F. Pfarrer, Hilton.
Henrietta B. Heitmann, South Kortright.
John L. Button, South New Berlin.
Leon P. Carey, Woodstock.
Richard M. Hunter, Wappingers Falls.

NORTH CAROLINA

James M. Armstrong, Belmont.

OHIO

Richard J. Phillips, Bowling Green.

OKLAHOMA

Bill M. Penwright, Calumet.

PENNSYLVANIA

William H. Strauch, Cressona.
Charles R. Root, Gillett.
Julia K. Hammond, Lima.

TENNESSEE

Norris Y. Brown, Bullsgap.
Sarah L. Graves, Louisville.
Fred Gentry, McEwen.
Jesse F. Branson, Washburn.
Gettis H. Hudson, Whitwell.

VIRGINIA

Thornton S. Terry, Axton.
Dorothy M. Cliborne, McKenney.

WEST VIRGINIA

Richard L. McDowell, Burlington.

WISCONSIN

Robert R. Smith, Caroline.
David P. Berger, Port Edwards.
Terence P. Arseneau, Washburn.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 22, 1955:

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Lealie F. Augsbach to be postmaster at Spring Lake in the State of Michigan.

PENNSYLVANIA

Frank A. Bialas to be postmaster at Wilmore in the State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, inspire us now with a more vivid sense of Thyself, in whom alone we may find strength for today and hope for tomorrow.

Grant that we may also have a conscience that is more sensitive and alert to the fact of human solidarity and the reality that mankind is one in origin and destiny.

Make us eager to minister to all the members of the human family in their struggles and longings for the blessings of health and happiness.

May it be the goal of all our aspirations to hasten the coming of that glorious day when there shall be peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-